Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-114
Wednesday
13 June 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-114 *13 June 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Negotiator Views Differences on Mobile Missiles *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Jun]* 1
Geneva Disarmament Conference Resumes *[TASS]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Problems of German Unification Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 3
Official Interviewed on Foreign, Germany Policy
[Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU 8 Jun] 3
CSCE Events Build Confidence, Collaboration *[PRAVDA 12 Jun]* 4
CSCE Envoy Views All-Europe Structure *[PRAVDA 12 Jun]* 5
U.S.-PLO Dialogue 'Facing Breakdown' *[PRAVDA 12 Jun]* 6

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Reportage, Commentary on Gorbachev Visit 7
Baker Views Improving Relations *[TASS]* 7
Gorbachev, Shevardnadze Interviewed *[Rome AVANTI! 5 Jun]* 7
'Priceless' Trust Shown *[PRAVDA 10 Jun]* 8
Kozyakov on Continued U.S. Trade Restrictions *[Moscow International]* 9
Background of Soviet-U.S. Oil Venture Explained *[IZVESTIYA 7 Jun]* 10
Nishanov Delegation's Canada Visit Continues *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jun]* 10

China

Yazov Talk With Military Delegation Continues *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Jun]* 11
Arms Reduction Along Sino-Soviet Border Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 12
Reportage on Liu Huaqing Visit to Moscow 12
Talks With Yazov Viewed *[Moscow International]* 12
Liu Visits Aircraft Plant *[Moscow International]* 13
PRC, Taiwan Unification Formulas Compared *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jun]* 13
PRC Minister First To Visit Maritime Kray *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Jun]* 14
Supervision Ministry Delegation Visits *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jun]* 14
Chinese Provincial Delegation Arrives Moscow *[TASS]* 14
Discusses Ties *[Moscow TV]* 14

Northeast Asia

Shevardnadze To Visit Japan in September *[AFP]* 14
Supreme Soviet Delegation Arrives in Japan *[TASS]* 14
Rogachev Briefs Japanese Officials on Summit *[TASS]* 15
Japan's Proposal for Asian Meeting Discussed *[Moscow International]* 15
RSFSR, Japan Prefecture Establish Friendship *[Moscow International]* 15
Kaifu Cited on Economic Aid, Kurils *[TASS]* 16
Cooperation Agreement Signed With ROK *[TASS]* 16
High-Level Contacts With ROK Reviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 16
ROK Committee To Promote Economic Cooperation *[TASS]* 17
Radio Liberty Distorts Ties With ROK *[TASS]* 17
Army Delegation Visits North Korea *[Moscow International]* 17
News Conference Held at DPRK Embassy in Moscow *[Moscow International]* 17
Effort for Detente in Asia Emphasized *[Moscow Radio]* 18

Southeast Asia & Pacific

'Importance' of Situation in Asia-Pacific Region *[Moscow International]* 18
Current Situation in Philippines Viewed *[Moscow International]* 19
Indonesian Delegation Pays Official Visit 20
Cooperation Discussed *[TASS]* 20
Lukyanov Briefs Delegation *[TASS]* 20

Near East & South Asia

Gorbachev's Personal Representative Visits Egypt 20
Envoy Received By Mubarak *[TASS]* 20
Envoy Briefs Mubarak on Summit *[TASS]* 20
Deputy Foreign Minister Petrovskiy Visits Iraq 21
Arrives in Baghdad for Talks *[TASS]* 21
Meets With Husayn, 'Arafat *[TASS]* 21
Protection of Emigres to Israel Affirmed *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 21
Moscow Sees Chance for Peace Under Shamir *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 22
Hashemi-Rafsanjani on Western Hostages Issue *[PRAVDA 8 Jun]* 22
Moscow Comments on Tehran-Baghdad Exchange *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 23
Moscow Views 'Confrontation' of Ideas in Iran *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 23
Foreign Ministry Meets With Arab League Envoy 24
Envoy Receives Soviet Official *[Kuwait KUNA]* 24
Envoy Pleased With Stance *[TASS]* 24
Egyptian Reportage on USSR Trade Argreement *[cross-reference]* 25

Sub-Saharan Africa

Spokesman Comments on 'Radical' RSA Reforms *[TASS]* 25
RSA Reforms Seen As 'Complicated' Situation *[Moscow International]* 25
South African Changes Seen 'Positively' *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jun]* 26
South Africa, ANC Negotiations Viewed *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 8 May]* 26
Ethiopian War, U.S. Joint Communique Examined *[Moscow International]* 26
Namibia's SWAPO, CPSU Sign Agreement *[PRAVDA 12 Jun]* 27
Somalia Opposition Rejects Samantar's Peace Plan *[Moscow International]* 27
Portugal Speeds Up Angolan Peace Process *[Moscow International]* 27

East Europe

Deputy Foreign Minister Meets Polish Ambassador *[TASS]* 28
Bulgaria's Zhelev Cited on Elections *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jun]* 28
Bulgarian Elections, Parties Described *[PRAVDA 2 Jun]* 29
German Unity Terms 'Dictated by FRG' *[PRAVDA 12 Jun]* 32

West Europe

Further on Shevardnadze, Genscher Meeting *[TASS]* 33
Visits War Memorial *[TASS]* 33
German Unity Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 13 Jun]* 34
Solton on German Unity *[Moscow International]* 35
Genscher Concludes Visit *[TASS]* 35
Supreme Soviet Committee Arrives in Bonn *[TASS]* 36
Baltic Fleet Detachment Ends Visit to FRG *[TASS]* 36
Petrovskiy Summarizes Work of Copenhagen Forum *[TASS]* 36
Meets With Danish Officials *[TASS]* 37
Ligachev's Stockholm News Conference Reported *[Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLAT 9 Jun]* 37
'Foreign' Submarines in Swedish Waters Viewed *[TASS]* 37
Swedish Media Overdramatize Hijacker's Handling *[IZVESTIYA 12 Jun]* 38
French Defense Minister Favors Changes in NATO *[TASS]* 38
Civil Defense Accord Signed With France *[TASS]* 38
Bakatin Meets With French Assembly President *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jun]* 39

Icelandic President Finnbogadottir Arrives *[PRAVDA 10 Jun]* 39
Meets With Ryzhkov *[TASS]* 39
Austrian Chancellor Reaffirms Neutrality Status *[TASS]* 39
Zholkver Analyzes Results of Thatcher Visit *[Moscow Radio]* 40

Latin America & Caribbean

Cuban Minister Condemns U.S. 'Provocations' *[Moscow Radio]* 40
Soviet-Cuban Economic Cooperation Meeting Opens *[TASS]* 41
Economic Cooperation To Improve *[TASS]* 41
Kvitsinskiy, Komplektov Confer With Cuba's Viera *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jun]* 41
Castro Receives Soviet Delegation 5 June *[TASS]* 42
Castro on Commitment to 'Socialism or Death' *[PRAVDA 5 Jun]* 42
Mayorov Discusses Delay of Noriega's Trial *[Moscow International]* 42

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet Reviews Economic Program *[TASS]* 43
Supreme Soviet Decision on Gorbachev Visit *[TASS]* 43
Committee Disbands Military Construction Units *[Moscow TV]* 44
Ryzhkov To Present Economic Program 13 Jun *[Moscow TV]* 44
Supreme Soviet Approves Law on Freedom of Press *[TASS]* 44
Supreme Soviet Abolishes Press Censorship *[AFP]* 44
Gorbachev Answers Deputies Questions 12 Jun *[Moscow TV]* 45
Gorbachev Speaks to Supreme Soviet 12 Jun *[Moscow TV]* 50

Political & Social

Gorbachev Attends Federation Council Meeting 57
Gorbachev Gives Speech *[PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 57
New National Structure Viewed *[TASS]* 61
Leaders Address Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 61
Gorbachev Receives Patriarch Aleksiy 12 Jun 62
Meeting Held *[TASS]* 62
Gorbachev Greeting to Patriarch *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jun]* 62
Ryzhkov Greeting to Patriarch *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jun]* 62
Restrictions Placed on KGB by Draft Law *[AFP]* 62
Peasants Congress Proceedings Continue 63
Ligachev Speech Criticized *[Moscow Radio]* 63
Ligachev on Agricultural Prospects *[TASS]* 63
Reportage on Preparations for CPSU Congress 63
No Foreign Guests Permitted *[TASS]* 63
Medvedev Outlines Work Details *[TASS]* 63
Delegates Elected Abroad *[PRAVDA 7 Jun]* 64
Shostakovskiy Loses Election *[VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA 28 May]* 64
Draft Platform Discussion Held *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 5 Jun]* 65
Vorotnikov Views Gorbachev Not In Any Danger *[London TV]* 68
Commentary Doubts Break Up of Soviet Union *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Government Has Six Months To Show Results *[Madrid ABC 29 May]* 69
USSR National Development Law Enacted *[IZVESTIYA 7 May]* 69
Latsis Comments on Party Issues *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 31 May]* 69
Two New Parties Present Platforms *[Moscow TV]* 71
Legislation Urges Caucasus Refugee Solution *[TASS]* 71
Centrist-Radical Bloc Unites on 'Consensus' Terms *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Jun]* 72
State Commission Discusses Soviet Germans *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jun]* 72
Leningrad Official Fears Social Unrest *[Hamburg WELT AM SONNTAG 10 Jun]* 73
Abalkin Rejects Polish Economic Methods *[Moscow Radio]* 74
Komsomol Concerns on Market Economy Voiced *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 7 Jun]* 74
Akhromeyev Views Changing Attitudes to Army *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 1 Jun]* 76
Lukyanov Attends Funeral of V.V. Kuznetsov *[IZVESTIYA 10 Jun]* 77

Eminent Ethnographer Yu.V. Bromley Dies *[PRAVDA 8 Jun]* 77
Leaders Sign Obituary of Retired Minister Lomako *[IZVESTIYA 31 May]* 77

Economic

Parliamentary Debate on Economic Reform Postponed *[AFP]* 77
Yarin Press Conference on Reforms Reported *[TRUD 6 Jun]* 78
Economists Set Out Views on Reform *[Moscow International]* 78
Economists Discuss Economic Reform Issues *[Moscow International]* 79
Miners, Officials on Ways To Avert Strikes *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 1 Jun]* 80
Conversion Concept Aimed at Earning Currency *[IZVESTIYA 7 Jun]* 83

Agricultural

Irkutsk Farms Afflicted by Prolonged Drought *[Moscow TV]* 83
Peasant Union Congress Opens 11 Jun *[PRAVDA 12 Jun]* 84
Arguments Against Planned Food Tax Listed *[IZVESTIYA 3 Jun]* 85

Scientific

Cosmonauts Pictured Entering 'Kristall' Module *[Moscow TV]* 87
'Kristall-Mir' Docking, Implications Reported *[Moscow TV]* 88

Military

Yazov, Lizichev, Frolov Speak at Festival *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Jun]* 88
Ministry Discusses Internal Troops *[TASS]* 89
Armed Forces Contribute Precious Metals *[TASS]* 89

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Gorbachev Meeting With Baltic Leaders 'Positive' *[Vilnius Radio]* 90
Interethnic Relations Viewed *[TASS]* 90
More on Meeting *[TASS]* 90
Moscow Official, Prunskiene Discuss Cooperation *[Vilnius Radio]* 91
Landsbergis Describes Meeting With Yeltsin *[Moscow TV]* 91
Vilnius Radio Carries 12 June Supreme Council 91
Agenda Adopted 91
University Statute Debated 92
Catholic Church Resolution Adopted 92
Rayon Chairman Speaks 92
TASS on 12 June Supreme Council Session 93
Communique on Lithuanian Economic Situation *[Vilnius Radio]* 93
Lithuanian Official Interviewed on Blockade *[Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP 4 Jun]* 93
Lithuanian Disdain for Economic Reality Criticized *[PRAVDA 2 Jun]* 94
Lithuanian Parliament Moves To 'Privatize' Land *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Jun]* 97
Lithuanian Military Society Chief Challenged *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Jun]* 97
Lithuanian Council Opposes Vilnius Polish Rayon *[Vilnius Radio]* 97
'Depolitization' Curbs CPSU 'Influence' *[TASS]* 98
Estonian Bank President on Proposed Currency *[TASS]* 98
U.S. Senator Meets With Estonian Leaders *[TASS]* 98
Defense Organization Reestablished in Latvia *[TASS]* 99
'Depoliticization' Aimed Against Communist Party *[IZVESTIYA 12 Jun]* 99
Latvian Party Congress Proceedings Reported *[PRAVDA 12 Jun]* 100
Report on 7 June Latvian Party Plenum *[Riga Radio]* 101
Gorbunov Meets U.S. Leningrad Consul General *[Moscow International]* 101
People's Front Calls for Freedom of Movement *[Riga International]* 102
Godmanis Remarks on Interior Ministry Post *[Riga Radio]* 102
Latvia's Resolution on Press Ownership Deplored *[PRAVDA 5 Jun]* 102
New Latvian Cultural Newspapers Published *[Moscow Maritime Service]* 103
Baltic Council Issues Final Document *[Riga International]* 103

Report Claims Summit 'Freezes Status Quo' *[Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET 6 Jun]* 104
Baltic Independence Referendums 'Not Required' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Jun]* 104
Baltic Industries Cooperate in Food Production *[Vilnius Radio]* 105

RSFSR

Opening Session of Supreme Soviet Reported *[TASS]* 105
Council Chairman Elected *[TASS]* 106
Congress Adopts Declaration of Sovereignty *[TASS]* 106
Constitutional Commission Formed *[TASS]* 106
PRAVDA on Adoption of Sovereignty Declaration *[13 Jun]* 106
Moscow TV Relays 12 June Congress Proceedings 107
Declaration Adopted 107
Amendments Debated 108
Voting Begins 108
Constitutional Commission Viewed 109
More on 12 June Congress Proceedings *[Moscow Radio]* 109
Yeltsin Notes Significance of Declaration *[Moscow TV]* 110
Deputy Chairman Views Sovereignty Declaration *[Moscow Radio]* 110
Deputy Travkin Comments on RSFSR Congress *[MOSCOW NEWS No 20]* 111
USSR Deputy Advocates ASSR Autonomy *[MOSCOW NEWS No 20]* 112
Russian Democratic Party Leaders on Policies *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Jun]* 113
Passport Requirement Extended for Goods Purchases *[Moscow Radio]* 114
Moscow Officials Describe Refugee Problem *[Moscow Radio]* 114
Unethical Conduct by Moscow Mayor Alleged *[VETERAN No 22]* 114
Prokofyev Addresses Moscow City Party Plenum *[VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA 31 May]* 117
Government Sends Condolences to Miners' Families *[Moscow Radio]* 122
Hurricane Hits North Ossetiya; Damage Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 122
Volgograd Party-Soviet Relations Examined *[IZVESTIYA 27 May]* 123

Western Republics

Five Killed in Ukraine Mine Explosion *[Moscow TV]* 124
Party Officials Not Invited to Miners' Congress *[IZVESTIYA 12 Jun]* 124
Grinev Elected Supreme Soviet Deputy Chairman *[Kiev International]* 124
'Constructive Opposition' Formed in Ukraine *[TASS]* 125
Status of Autocephalous Orthodox Church Noted *[Kiev International]* 125
Christian Democratic League Holds Congress *[TASS]* 125
Romanian TV Chief Visits Moldavia *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 30 May]* 125
Objections to Changing Moldavia's Name Noted *[Moscow International]* 125

Caucasus

Transcaucasian Railroad 'Approaching Normal' *[Moscow Radio]* 126
Armenia Reports 'Tense' Weekend 9-10 June *[Yerevan Radio]* 126
Armenian Officials Denounce Critical Report *[Yerevan Radio]* 127
Monument to Armenian Komsomol Leader Blown Up
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Jun] 127
'Strife' Among Georgian Nationalists Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Jun]* 127

Central Asia

Continuing Reportage on Disorder in Kirghizia 129
Situation Updated *[TASS]* 129
Situation Becoming 'Stabilized' *[Moscow TV]* 129
Update on Status of Violence *[Frunze Radio]* 129
Osh Region Quiet, Frunze Normal *[TASS]* 129
Kazakh CP Congress Reflects 'Gentler' Change *[PRAVDA 11 Jun]* 129

Negotiator Views Differences on Mobile Missiles

PM1206104390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Interview with G. Khromov, member of the Soviet delegation at the USSR-U.S. Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms, by unidentified KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent; place and date of interview not specified; "For the Sake of Equal Security"—first two paragraphs are introduction:]

[Text] Even now, after the Washington summit meeting, you can encounter reports in the Western press, above all the U.S. press, saying that the Soviet Union is to blame for the delay in the preparation of the treaty on 50-percent cuts in strategic offensive arms, since it rejects the U.S. proposal for a ban on MIRVed ICBMs, including mobile-based missiles.

In this connection our correspondent asked G. Khromov, member of the Soviet delegation at the USSR-U.S. Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms, to provide the requisite explanations. This is what he said:

[Khromov] MIRVs for ballistic missiles first appeared in the United States 20 years ago. In 1970 the silo-based "Minuteman-3" missiles began to be fitted with them, followed by the "Poseidon" submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) in 1971. One missile of this type replaced several previous missiles—single-warhead missiles carrying warheads with a single nuclear charge. Moreover each warhead on the new-type missiles could be aimed at an individual target. The "Minuteman-3" was subsequently flight-tested with between three and seven warheads, and "Poseidon" was tested with up to 14.

These missiles represented a considerable destabilizing factor. One side gained an opportunity to rapidly increase its strategic potential while the other (which did not possess missiles of this kind) could have been "tempted" to strike first and knock out important targets like MIRVed missiles, particularly in areas where they were concentrated.

Realizing that things were heading toward a new round of the arms race and serious disruption of stability, in 1974 the Soviet Union proposed banning (or limiting in some other way) this kind of weapon. The proposal was rejected. The U.S. side was proceeding on the premise that U.S. technological superiority would also secure U.S. strategic superiority. However, the calculations that we would lag behind for many years proved groundless. The first Soviet MIRVed ballistic missiles appeared in 1975. Once again the possibility arose of not only talking about strategic balance but also ensuring it.

Nevertheless, the idea was increasingly maturing among the scientific community and in military circles in the USSR and the United States that they should seek to attain stability in relations between the two countries and deter one another from making a surprise attack not by increasing the number of nuclear arms—albeit in equal quantities—but through the lowest possible levels of these arms. Enhanced survivability would make it possible to retain forces for a retaliatory strike and thus deter a potential aggressor from a surprise attack.

This concept was articulated quite clearly in the early 1980's by President Reagan's adviser, Scowcroft. Approved by the U.S. administration, it envisaged a gradual transition to strategic arms carrying a reduced number of nuclear charges and to arms with maximum survivability, that is, a transition to mobile basing (road or rail). It was proposed to implement the idea of developing strategic forces while at the same time reducing the number of ICBMs by means of a USSR-U.S. treaty on reducing strategic offensive arms.

This approach certainly seems reasonable and could not fail to win support among those people who were and still are striving to find a way out of the impasse of dangerous nuclear confrontation. But it must be stressed most forcefully here that it is impermissible to seek one-sided advantages during the process of reducing strategic offensive arms while simultaneously changing their structure by retaining the arms least conducive to a first nuclear strike—after all, one side's security cannot be ensured at the expense of the other side's.

In today's conditions, to raise the question as some people in the West are doing of banning mobile-based MIRVed ICBMs (and banning these arms alone) is tantamount to an attempt to procure one-sided advantages. At present only the USSR has arms of this kind. Our country, with its vast territory, has resolved the task of creating mobile systems with enhanced survivability, primarily ground-based systems. What about the United States? Gravitating more toward the sea than we are, it has created a grouping of mobile sea-launched strategic offensive arms—MIRVed SLBMs—which is considerably superior to the corresponding Soviet grouping. It is for precisely this reason that the Americans are endeavoring by hook or by crook to prevent any measures to limit and reduce their grouping. Yet it is quite easy to prove that MIRVed SLBMs are no more "peaceful" a weapon than ground-based mobile MIRVed ICBMs.

Nevertheless, we have not evaded discussing the question of our mobile missiles either. It is well known that a definite accord was secured at the Washington summit meeting regarding such missiles. As for the problem of MIRVed ICBMs in general, it is to be resolved outside the framework of the strategic offensive arms treaty currently under preparation in Geneva. It is thought that it should be the subject of future talks on nuclear and space arms.

Geneva Disarmament Conference Resumes

LD1206140990 Moscow TASS in English 1323 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS Correspondent Boris Shabayev]

[Text] Geneva June 12 TASS—The summer session of the United Nations conference on disarmament opened at the Geneva Palace today with delegations from 40

member-countries and more than 30 observer countries in attendance. The session is expected to focus on a wide range of issues covering every aspect of nuclear arms reductions, a ban on chemical weapons, an end to nuclear tests, and ways to strengthen reciprocal trust.

One of the main items of this vast agenda is completing preparations for a comprehensive convention on the complete prohibition of production and utilisation of chemical weapons and destruction of its stockpiles.

It is noted here that the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the destruction and non-production of chemical weapons, recently signed in Washington by Presidents Gorbachev and Bush, marking the first time that a major part of the chemical weapons stockpiles of the two countries will be eliminated, creates favourable conditions for the crowning of many years of work.

The current session of the conference on disarmament will last throughout August.

Problems of German Unification Discussed

LD0806200690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1625 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] One of the most acute international problems attracting the most intent attention both of statesmen and the public at large is the unification of Germany. Its eternal aspects have been discussed both at the Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington and at today's meeting of the Warsaw Pact political consultative committee in Moscow, and at the European conference that has been taking place over the last few days in Copenhagen. I shall ask our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver to tell us about the course of this discussion in greater detail.

[Zholkver] I shall note first of all that the tempo of discussion of the external aspects of German unification has obviously been stepped up of late. You see, not even a week has passed between the meetings in Washington, Moscow, and Copenhagen. Fresh meetings have moreover already been scheduled regarding this issue. Today in Scotland. Tomorrow a meeting is expected between President Gorbachev and Prime Minister Thatcher of Great Britain, and between President Bush and FRG Chancellor Kohl. And at the beginning of next week talks are planned between Comrade Shevardnadze and FRG Foreign Minister Genscher, and between President Bush and de Maiziere, head of the GDR Government. A fresh meeting of the ministers of foreign affairs of the six—the two German powers and the four powers of the anti-Hitler coalition—which has launched the "two-plus-four" negotiation mechanism is scheduled for 22 June in Berlin.

Thus, the dialogue on the external aspects of the construction of German unity is becoming increasingly active and extensive. Specific measures for the unification of Germany should be introduced and synchonized. They have entered the practical phase, after the signing between the GDR and the FRG of the treaty on setting up a currency and economic and social union which is to come into force from 1 July.

One cannot, moreover, fail to see that in regulating the external aspects of German unity, as well as the internal ones, quite a few extremely serious problems emerge. Above all it is a question of preserving the existing balance of forces in European and world politics. If one simply includes a united Germany in NATO, as Atlantic politicians propose, then such a balance will obviously be disrupted. Therefore at the present time, at very different forums, alternative variants are being put forward and examined. There are a multitude of them. But I think that their most characteristic feature is the attempt to get away from the previous bloc thinking and to proceed to setting up general European security structures in which a united Germany would also be included. In particular it is proposed that an all-European center to prevent and resolve conflicts should be set up and located in Berlin. There are also other proposals ranging from the founding of a permanent secretariat to regular meetings of ministers of foreign affairs and heads of state in Europe. It is thereby stressed—the ministers of foreign affairs of both German states also made such statements in Copenhagen—that the most important prerequisite for the creation and successful functioning of European-wide security structures is further progress in reducing arms on the European continent.

The Soviet Union is making quite a big contribution to this. There in Copenhagen, Comrade Shevardnadze reported our country's decision to cut 140 missile launchers and 3,200 guns for nuclear munitions [atomniye crudiya]. I will remind you that the United States also intends to withdraw part of its nuclear artillery from Europe and has stated its readiness to start talks on the nuclear missiles remaining on the continent. It seems that the more efficiently that the process of disarmament progresses in Europe, along with the elimination of the confrontation of the military groupings, the more successful will be the settlement of the external aspects of the unification of Germany as well.

Official Interviewed on Foreign, Germany Policy

AU0806142890 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 8 Jun 90 p 6

[Interview with Vyacheslav Dashichev, deputy director of the Moscow Institute for Eastern Europe and International Studies, by correspondent Elfie Siegl in Moscow; date not given: "The Pact Is Already Dissolving"]

[Text] [Siegl] Also after the latest summit, the central problem for the USSR, the United States, and Europe remains the question of the future of a united Germany's membership in a military-political alliance. Has there not been any rapprochement of standpoints?

[Dashichev] In Washington, Gorbachev and Bush stated that Germany itself could decide the question of its military-political status on the basis of the principle of self-determination. This is something new. Thus, everything depends on the development in Germany even though the FRG, the GDR, and later the all-German government cannot ignore the security requirements of the neighbors.

[Siegl] Did Gorbachev say that the Germans should hold a referendum on NATO membership?

[Dashichev] One cannot rule out this possibility. However, the question can also be solved by an all-German parliament. At the moment, the positions of the USSR and the United States still seem irreconcilable: the desired nonalignment and neutrality is opposed by the desired NATO membership. However, one could come to many compromises: Germany's NATO membership is not a danger to Soviet security interests. In this case, one could link NATO membership with certain conditions. For instance, the reduction of the German armed forces or the reduction of the foreign troops in Germany which could stay there for a transitional period but whose presence in Germany, however, would be a violation of German sovereignty in the long run.

Further compromises are the elimination of nuclear weapons on German territory and the establishment of a demilitarized zone in central Europe. Of course, the strategy of NATO must be changed; the strategy of flexible response and of forward defense must be abolished and the first use of nuclear weapons must be renounced.

The transformation of NATO from a military to a political alliance could keep pace with Germany's unification over the coming months. In East Europe one could form some sort of political assembly, the task of which—together with NATO—would be solving problems of stability, security, and cooperation in Europe.

[Siegl] Which role will the Warsaw Pact play then? Will it dissolve?

[Dashichev] It is already in the process of dissolving, its place can be taken by the political assembly or by a political consultative committee. In the 1990's Europe has to overcome the bloc-to-bloc relations and has to replace them with a system of collective security.

[Siegl] There is not yet full trust between the USSR and the West. Soviet foreign policy still has to achieve quite a lot. Who determines its guidelines today?

[Dashichev] The neo-Stalinists, the open Stalinists, and also the upper echelon of our army criticize that the USSR has lost its supremacy under Gorbachev and Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. These people from the conservative camp accuse Gorbachev and Shevardnadze of having undermined the balance of powers with perestroyka and the new way of thinking in foreign policy. But Gorbachev and Shevardnadze are not the ones to blame: The reason lies in the old Stalinist command system.

The reformers think completely differently: For them the events in East Europe over the past months are a salvation for the USSR, a liberation from the detrimental legacy of Stalinism because Stalin's policy drove the USSR into a confrontation with the West, signified an enormous burden to Soviet economy, and was aimed against the national interests of the USSR. We could have achieved friendship with the East European states also without supremacy. The reformers are for the peoples' right to self-determination, for an end to the cold war, and for an end to the abnormal division of Germany and Europe. The neo-Stalinists, some of whom are also sitting in our Foreign Ministry, want the postwar status quo; the reformers think that it hurts the national interests of the USSR.

[Siegl] Gorbachev still has advisers, such as Aleksandr Bondarenko, chief of the Third European Department of the Foreign Ministry; Valentin Falin, chief of the International Department of the Central Committee; his predecessor Vadim Zagladin; and former Soviet Ambassador to the United States Anatoliy Dobrynin—all of them functionaries of the Brezhnev era. Are there no others available in the sixth year of perestroyka or does Gorbachev not want any other advisers?

[Dashichev] Strangely enough, these people are still influencing our foreign policy. Here we have the same picture as in the economy, where the supporters of the administrative methods are in panic because of the market. In foreign policy the pupils of Brezhnev and Gromyko cannot understand and recognize the new realities. But we stand on the eve of a change of generations in the Foreign Ministry and diplomacy; foreign policy needs fresh blood.

In Germany policy, too, there were attempts to save what no longer existed after the November revolution in the GDR. This was removed from any reality. Whoever wants to save the status quo at any cost, even though it can no longer be saved, hurts our national interests. The peoples in East Europe have overcome the postwar status quo and have driven away their totalitarian regimes. This is understood in our country by an increasing number of people who see and assess things differently from the apprentices of Brezhnev and Gromyko.

[Siegl] Has the election of Boris Yeltsin as president of the Russian parliament given rise to a qualitatively new situation for the Soviet domestic and foreign policy?

[Dashichev] Yeltsin has not yet commented on foreign policy, but his attitude to solving the Baltic conflict shows that he advocates a standpoint that is completely different from that of Gorbachev. Yeltsin is looking for peaceful solutions so that our peoples do not become alienated. He has repeatedly come out against the economic blockade which Gorbachev has imposed against Lithuania and which damages our interests and also causes considerable economic problems for Belorussia, Russia, and other republics of the Union. If Yeltsin advocates negotiations without an ultimatum, this is only sensible.

CSCE Events Build Confidence, Collaboration

PM1206132390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1,6

[Dispatch by special correspondent A. Lopukhin: "Diplomacy Without Protocol. All-European Forum in Copenhagen"]

[Text] Copenhagen, 11 Jun—The second CSCE Conference on the Human Dimension is continuing in the Danish capital. Delegations from 33 European countries, the United States, and Canada are exchanging information on the progress in carrying out the commitments they assumed under the Vienna Final Document in the humanitarian and moral sphere.

The Soviet delegation's report on these problems was highly assessed by many conference participants. An important part of the Copenhagen conference is being taken up by discussion of problems such as how to ensure the supremacy of the law and to create a European rule-of-law space. The participants are devoting particular attention to the rights of national minorities which, it is generally agreed, should be safeguarded with due consideration for states' territorial integrity and unity.

Recently there has been a tangible increase in the understanding that peace on the continent depends not only on safeguarding security in the military sphere but also on the degree of confidence peoples have in each other. Therefore it was no accident that people in Copenhagen have been working actively with professional and people's diplomats representing around 40 of the most varied national and international nongovernmental organizations—human rights, trade union, women's, youth organizations, and others.

Each day they hold several parallel events, as they are called here. One of these—the three-day seminar entitled "The Human Dimension of the All-European Process"—started today. It was organized by the "Denmark-USSR" Society, the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries [SSOD], and the "France-USSR" Society.

Work is also continuing at the "Bella Center" where the official events of the Copenhagen conference are being held. USSR People's Deputy V.V. Tereshkova, chairman of the SSOD Presidium and of its Helsinki Commission, spoke at the plenary session here today. The holding of parallel social conferences, seminars, and hearings, she stressed, is not a sign of any lack of confidence in official diplomacy, but a desire to supplement the efforts it is making to safeguard the human dimension of the all-European process. The creation of a common space in Europe is impossible without public participation—be it in the sphere of the law, the economy, ecology, information, or culture.

In order to ensure progress in protecting people V.V. Tereshkova proposed that a whole series of confidence-building measures in the humanitarian sphere be discussed. It is a question of developing social mechanisms for monitoring the fulfillment of international treaties and conventions; increasing exchanges of delegations of parliamentarians and representatives of the public during elections and referendums; and ensuring access for nongovernmental organizations to open judicial hearings, the grounds for which may be dubious....

These and other measures together with the further development of contacts between people will promote the strengthening of mutual confidence, collaboration, and cooperation in Europe.

The third CSCE Conference on the Human Dimension will be held in Moscow in September-October next year. In preparing for it, it would be useful to take account of the rich and varied experience of the Copenhagen forum—which has been wide-ranging and open to dialogue. On the basis of this experience, we can conclude in particular that we should start preparing for the Moscow conference right now and create as quickly as possible a national social committee for the staging of its parallel events.

CSCE Envoy Views All-Europe Structure

PM1206155590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Dispatch by Igor Melnikov under the "Correspondents Comment" rubric: "Time Is Rushing By. Vienna Talks Gain Second Wind"]

[Text] Vienna, 11 Jun—Time is pressing Europeans onward. At the end of this year the leaders of the states involved in the Helsinki process will gather for a summit meeting. The long traditions of verbal wrangling seem to have receded into the past and people everywhere are impatiently asking the following question: What is to replace them, and how are the new structures for security and strengthening stability in Europe really to be formed?

The recent Warsaw Pact and NATO conferences—one in Moscow, the other in Scotland—figuratively speaking burned the candle of uncertainty and the residue of mistrust at both ends. One can understand the mutual desire to make the fullest possible use of the available instruments, the most important being the Vienna talks which are divided into two independent areas—on confidence-building measures (involving 35 countries) and conventional armed forces in Europe (23 countries)—in building an all-European home.

The 35 countries' last plenary sitting graphically showed the states' desire to organically tailor their recommendations to fit the rapidly-forming new European landscape. No one hides the fact that the process of German unification is one of the factors rendering the creation of different all-European structures topical now. However, future stability and predictability in the European situation and the prevention of another split in the continent are even more important aims for the participants in the Vienna talks on confidence-building measures.

"How far are the participants in the talks up to this task?" I asked USSR delegation head O. Grinevskiy.

"The task is facilitated by the fact," he replied, "that a firm foundation exists for joint efforts. That is the Helsinki Final Act along with the associated accords, regulations, standards, and procedures. If you add to this the rich practice and the accumulated experience of cooperation, it becomes clear that it is feasible to create a new all-European structure to firmly withstand a split in the new European community."

In the diplomat's opinion, this structure could incorporate a quite definite range of elements. First, a grand European council or assembly—a forum of the 35 states' supreme leaders to consider fundamental questions of European policy. Second, a committee or council of foreign ministers to prepare questions for examination at summit meetings and make sure that decisions are fulfilled.

My observations as a correspondent confirm that the Vienna talks among the 35 states are now gaining a

second wind. It could not be otherwise: Their participants hardly favor the prospect of being "left behind" by the dynamic, positive events which are not, I believe, bypassing a single European state.

U.S.-PLO Dialogue 'Facing Breakdown'

PM1206154990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Dispatch by own correspondent S. Filatov: "Dialogue on the Brink of Breakdown"]

[Text] Algiers, 11 Jun—The U.S.-Palestinian dialogue conducted in Tunis since December 1988 is facing breakdown. U.S. President G. Bush has stated that he intends to end talks with the PLO.

The crisis in bilateral relations arose in late May when an armed group of Palestinians attempted to make a seaborne landing in the Tel Aviv suburbs. The Israelis attacked the group; four people were killed and 12 captured. The Palestine Liberation Front (PLF), one of the organizations making up the PLO, claimed responsibility for the raid. The United States demanded that the PLO leadership condemn this action, but Yasir 'Arafat stated that the PLO is not responsible for it since it had nothing to do with it. Nor did he agree to Washington's other demand—to expel PLF leader Muhammad 'Abbas from the PLO Executive Committee—explaining that only the Palestine National Council, the parliament in exile, is empowered to make such decisions.

Following this the United States, under increasing pressure from Israel supporters in Washington—as THE INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE writes—threatened to suspend talks and R. Pelletreau, their ambassador to Tunisia, informed the Palestinians of this. At a two-day session in Baghdad the PLO Executive Committee decided not to give in to this pressure. After the session ended a PLO spokesman stated: The U.S. threats are an open challenge to the resolutions of the last Arab summit and the UN Security Council.

Many observers believe that Washington has long been seeking a pretext to end contacts with the PLO and is now using Yasir 'Arafat's refusal to condemn the PLF raid for this purpose. But, in the opinion of Abu Iyad, one of the PLO leaders, the breakdown in dialogue is important for the United States too—"it would mark the end of the Baker plans" for a Near East settlement. The PLO leadership, Abu Iyad stated, does not want to break off the dialogue with the United States, but if this happens it "will not be heartbroken" since nothing has changed recently in the U.S. position vis-a-vis the Palestinians.

United States & Canada

Reportage, Commentary on Gorbachev Visit

Baker Views Improving Relations

LD1206190390 Moscow TASS in English 1845 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy]

[Text] Washington June 12 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State James Baker addressed the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee with the speech on Soviet-American relations.

Recent developments in the international arena, especially the tendency towards democracy and economic reform, Baker said, clearly meet the U.S. long-term interests.

Great prospects open up for the creation of a more democratic, more prosperous and more secure world. These prospects depend to a considerable degree on whether the United States and the Soviet Union will be able to achieve a solid improvement of the two countries' relations.

Baker said the United States is now committed to achieving this goal by way of looking for solutions, which are to the two countries' benefit.

In this search, Baker pointed out, the United States is guided by the desire to build a new world in which both the cold war and the conflicts preceding it will become things of the past. This search is also determined by the potential of perestroyka, the Soviet Union's desire to reform its economy and, moreover, its social system.

Perestroyka deserves support, Baker said, exactly because it enables a more constructive Soviet foreign and defence policy and eventually a more democratic Soviet Union." [quotation mark as received]

Gorbachev, Shevardnadze Interviewed

PM1106093490 Rome AVANTI! in Italian 5 Jun 90 p 14

[APN/Adnkronos interview with President Mikhail Gorbachev and Foreign Minister Edvard Shevardnadze; date, place not given—respondents not identified in interview]

[Text] "From polar opposition to partnership via rivalry." This was how Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, together with Foreign Minister Edvard Shevardnadze, described relations between the United States and Soviet Union in an exclusive interview with APN and Adnkronos at the end of the Washington summit.

[Question] Do you not believe that this summit could be considered a new starting point?

[Answer] Between our peoples there have been both confrontation and polar opposition, and usually when this happens between us it spreads to the East and West as a whole. Well, we know what point we had reached—the edge of the precipice. We had accumulated such a quantity of weapons that now it is actually difficult to rid ourselves of them; but it is my hope that we will succeed. This is the path that we are pursuing.

We damaged our relations a long time ago: We sowed suspicions and wasted resources—especially the resources of two such powerful states as ours and the United States. We have so many problems! We must resolve them. But even wealthy America has major problems, and it, too, needs to release resources in order to resolve them. Although we emerged from polar opposition, rivalry nevertheless existed, and perhaps still exists. And there are those who want things to remain just like that. This has been said by some very eminent political scientists, or even politicians—influential people who believe that our two states and peoples are doomed to perpetual rivalry. I do not share this viewpoint. Signs of partnership are already emerging—and not only in the economic field. Cooperation is taking shape to settle global issues and to resolve the problems of regional conflicts. The concrete results of this cooperation—of this partnership, if you like—already exist. From polar opposition to partnership via rivalry: This is the formula dictated by actual conditions, by life.

When we started our battle for a nonviolent and nuclear-free world and discussed it four years ago, some people claimed that it was an illusion, a utopia. Look how far we have reached now. We are about to achieve a 50-percent reduction of strategic weapons, in Vienna we are on the point of cutting conventional weapons, and we are approaching a ban on chemical weapons. Overall, the world has started to change for the better. In order for things to continue along this path, two major peoples such as the Soviet and American peoples, our two powerful states, carry a truly unique responsibility.

[Question] So, a partnership in the future, too?

[Answer] Yes, a partnership: I believe that this is a very immediate prospect. Although, you see, this is all taking place through a very difficult struggle. The course of this summit was very dramatic, too. We heard that this is exactly how it was. I was here until the last moment, and meanwhile Shevardnadze was telephoning me to agree on the final solutions in order to emerge from a critical situation.

[Question] Are you referring to the economic and trade agreement?

[Answer] Not only that. But let the mechanisms of the agreement remain behind the scenes, as they say. But the fact that it all ended with such results is something that I deem extremely important. It is something that is in our interests, in the Americans' interests, and in the whole world's interests.

[Question] Perhaps it is still difficult to draw any conclusions. Was it really so critical and difficult?

[Answer] Yes, perhaps you are right. I do not know whether what happened could be compared to the formation of the anti-Nazi coalition. At that time we overlooked everything and created a united struggle, a front against fascism, against the force that threatened civilization. We forgot our ideological differences and agreed to cooperate, despite everything. I must say that now this cooperation is of similar significance and similar worth. A 50 percent reduction of strategic nuclear weapons itself is overwhelming.

If we add to this a trade agreement, which for decades we were unable even to approach, and a whole range of other agreements—including those on chemical weapons; nuclear tests; and other matters of prime importance, from science to technology and means of transport—we have a very significant whole. So we can say that a major event has occurred.

But there is something else that I would like to say: If we confine ourselves solely to listing these aspects, it is as though our yardstick were solely quantitative. It is necessary, however, to take account of the time at which this event has taken place. The summit occurs at a time of profound and dynamic transformations in the world and is advancing positively in a climate of understandings—a climate that strengthens confidence. It is a demonstration of new thinking, new approaches to cooperation, and is of fundamental significance in international relations as a whole.

'Priceless' Trust Shown

PM1206091390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Anatoliy Karpychev: "Presidents and Compliments"]

[Text] While watching the presidents' meeting in Washington, I suddenly thought with a smile that this time they had become truly lavish with their compliments to one another. Whether they wished to hear these compliments is another question, but, from the sidelines, the mutual sympathy of George Bush and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was very marked.

The Western public also noted this point, but its reaction to it was mixed. Some said: In his relations with the USSR the U.S. President is wrong to stake everything on Gorbachev, who has a host of difficulties and troubles back home, and if he suddenly has to go, the United States will be bitterly sorry. Others assessed the new atmosphere of the meeting as a sign of great changes—present and future.

I have more sympathy with the second point of view, although I can understand the first as well. Our president did not disguise his deep satisfaction with his joint work with George Bush. He favors personal contacts and personal good relations. He values Bush as a statesman capable of building a dialogue with great political responsibility and seeking ways toward consensus.

When they hearing those words, journalists at the joint press conference made a point of seeking clarification: Did these qualities of the U.S. President play any part in the fact that the meeting managed to achieve a great deal and move forward on problems that had formerly seemed insoluble? Yes, they played a part. Our president remarked that both he and President Bush had shown a desire to conduct business informally. "This is very important. Provided, of course, that each remains himself." Mention was also made of human compatibility, which creates an atmosphere making it possible to clarify the deep-seated causes of various processes.

The U.S. President responded in kind. He behaved with great dignity, he was laconic, but he firmly knew what he and his administration wanted. He was asked earlier about Gorbachev's "prospects," to which his reply was: It is not for me, the U.S. President, to decide who ought to lead the Soviet Union. "I see in Mr. Gorbachev a man under whom dramatic changes have taken place in East Europe for the benefit of freedom and all mankind. I pay tribute to him for this," G. Bush said shortly before the meeting. "I see in him a man who talks of perestroyka, reforms, and glasnost in the USSR. I pay tribute to him for this as well... I do not think that foreign policy should be shaped by one man. That cannot happen. I am sure that the majority of Western leaders see in Gorbachev a man with whom we can speak frankly and with whom we share many principles. He is a man who is facing a mass of problems inside his country—I am talking primarily about economic problems—and a man who is trying to work constructively with us in many areas."

From good motives, the U.S. President even named in one of his speeches the home village of the distinguished Soviet guest. He remarked with approval that, translated into English, "Privolnoye" in the North Caucasus means "spacious" or "free," and this reminded him, Bush, of the new wind of freedom blowing over Europe and all the world...

In short, there were more than enough compliments and graphic metaphors. The presidents clearly demonstrated that they need a human atmosphere, they met each other halfway, and, as one newspaper remarked, it was a "virtuoso political game."

High-level meetings, for all their responsibility and earnestness, are always something of a game. But they are not playthings. Everyone who observed the behavior of the presidents asked a simple question—What will we get out of this? The Americans asked this question too. The problems of German unification, the lessons of Lithuania, the trade agreement, and arms reductions were interwoven in a single tangle in this political dialogue. But that was not all. Both the Americans, and

even more so we ourselves, knew what a difficult situation the USSR president is facing at home. The Americans kept on saying that the Kremlin has a weak hand, and that Bush should exploit this.

Bush, it seems to me, did not exploit it, which earned him criticism from certain quarters.

Here I should say that presidents in general are criticized with relish more often than other figures, and our president is no exception. But at home we are sometimes so reckless in our criticism that it goes beyond the bounds of common sense. Behind Gorbachev there was a country roused by perestroyka with a mass of problems, but he put up an excellent showing and acted as both its propagandist and its champion. He spoke of the attractiveness of our market, while the businessman sat at times with stony faces and pondered how serious it all was. He debated, he invited, he virtually goaded them, but this was the business world, which was in no hurry to rush headlong in the footsteps of a popular leader. Well, we should have the same restraint...

One newspaper even remarked: "Western investors are by no means lining up to begin doing business with the Soviet Union. It sometimes takes three days to call abroad from the country. It is even harder to export profits. And fears of repression still further increase the risk of such investments."

I am deliberately avoiding an assessment of the meeting on the basis of a list of the agreements signed at it. Because it is not only these that give an impression of it. Something essentially new appeared this time. We saw not only duly empowered statesmen—elegant, almost solemn, wearing neckties—but we suddenly discovered that rivals can become partners, can chat without their neckties despite their disagreements, and can even play "horseshoes" at a moment of relaxation.

It is possible to talk or conjecture about what advantages the meeting has brought to one side or the other, about whether the trade agreement that was signed conditionally will bring Gorbachev a breathing space, or about what political dividends President Bush gathered. But it is impossible not to see the "new closeness" of the leaders. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, one paper argued, the barriers preventing the establishment of a personal relationship have collapsed in relations between the presidents. But in that case it is permissible to enquire: Where did the new quality of the meetings suddenly arise from?

Naturally, from the spirit and essence of the meetings themselves. Not only those with the U.S. President. And not suddenly. This is the reward of our approaches in foreign policy, which have met, quite naturally, with a response from the other side. I recall the recent visit to our country of French President F. Mitterrand—there was personal contact there. Recall the visit to Canada, the meetings with Prime Minister Brian Mulroney. Look at the visit of Margaret Thatcher—she is in our country at the moment. All these have demonstrafted, in my view, what M.S. Gorbachev, at the luncheon in honor of the delegations of the Warsaw Pact states which met in Moscow last Thursday, called mutual trust.

The trust factor also did not appear all of a sudden. Some years ago journalists persistently asked Ronald Reagan: "Do you trust Gorbachev? Would you trust him with your wallet?" The former president replied to this with the Russian saying "Trust, but verify," or with the following political cliche: Countries distrust each other not because they are armed; on the contrary they arm because they distrust each another.

Trust in politics is a priceless thing.

I watch once again the recordings relating to the summit. I somehow liked the thoughts I heard, the formulas, the political compliments. Here are a few. I sometimes find it difficult to say who they belong to.

...A day will come when peoples will want peace so much that governments will have to go and satisfy their wishes.

...What is happening in the USSR is necessary not only for us, but also for the whole world.

...All the answers are ahead of us, not behind.

Kozyakov on Continued U.S. Trade Restrictions

LD0806045290 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] The House of Representatives of the United States Congress has approved a bill that preserves restrictions in trade with this country. Vladislav Kozyakov comments:

This was the first congressional discussion of trade with the Soviet Union after the summit in Washington. After the Soviet Union and the United States signed a trade agreement and after a dozen other far-reaching agreements were concluded, agreements which the two sides recognized as notably promoting trust and cooperation. But soon after Congress rushed to forbid the sale of United States' computers, telecommunications equipment, and other hi-tech goods to the Soviet Union. Did the congressmen act on the American people's will when they supported the bills? Hardly.

I refuse to imagine that the Americans at large, who welcomed President Mikhail Gorbachev, could harbor a grudge in the shape of cold war bans at the same time. And I refuse to believe supporters of the ban in the House of Representatives acted on behalf of American business interests. Both the large scale contracts this country has just signed with Chevron, IBM, Control Data, and other companies, and the meetings the Soviet president had with American business tycoons in Minneapolis and San Francisco are ample evidence that the two sides want normal and mutually advantageous ties. I can only think of obsolete stereotypes behind the congressional attempts to hinder trade with this country. The key arguments of congressmen boil down to the

events taking place in this country. True, parliament has not yet adopted a law on entry and exit. And Moscow has applied economic sanctions toward Lithuania. But these complicated problems of perestroyka are getting action under the national constitution.

Is it proper and fitting for the legislative body of another nation to interfere. At a meeting with the leaders of Congress in Washington last week Mikhail Gorbachev warned the members of parliament, both American and Soviet, against teaching one another lessons. This he pointed out would damage respect, prestige, sovereignty, and national dignity. What would Americans say if the Soviet parliament conditioned relations with the United States on the adoption of any internal laws in Congress? During the Washington summit politicians seemed in agreement that perestroyka in the USSR is in American national interests and that America believes it must assist perestroyka. But when the House of Representatives had to support this view to have more normal trade with the Soviet Union most congressmen proved unprepared for this.

Gentlemen, actions do speak louder than words.

Background of Soviet-U.S. Oil Venture Explained

PM0806123990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[I. Zhagel report: "Joint Project"]

[Text] As already reported, during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the United States an agreement was signed between the USSR Ministry of the Petroleum and Gas Industry and the "Chevron" corporation on setting up a joint venture to exploit the Tengiz oil field in West Kazakhstan.

This step can certainly be regarded as a breakthrough in the two countries' economic relations. Political barriers and the turbulent processes of perestroyka had deterred American businessmen from making large investments in the development of our national economy. The contract on creating this joint venture means the partners will invest billions in a petroleum refining complex.

For the moment it is difficult to talk about the participants' shares in the joint venture and the distribution of profits. However, according to L. Churilov, first deputy minister of the USSR Ministry of the Petroleum and Gas Industry, the first phase of the new complex, which is designed to extract and refine 30 million tonnes of petroleum annually, will require around 10 billion rubles [R]. Our country has already invested over R2 billion in this project, half of it in hard currency.

Naturally, the following question arises: Shouldn't we ourselves finish the job and exploit the oil field ourselves, so as not to share the profits with anyone else? However, given the country's current budget deficit, the development of the field might drag on for many years, merely exacerbating the situation in our economy. And on the other hand, the rapid commissioning of capacities will not only make it possible to start to recoup expenditure in the near future but will also release a significant amount of hard currency which is now being spent on buying essential raw materials for the country.

It is primarily a matter here of sulfur, which is used in many sectors of the national economy. The high content of hydrogen sulfide in the Tengiz oil field will make it possible to extract this chemical element in large quantities. And our country may turn from an importer of sulfur into a large-scale exporter. It is also planned to produce a wide range of polymers from the casinghead gas.

However, it is clear that the presence of hydrogen sulfide also creates serious problems. The Astrakhan gas condensate field not far from Tengiz can serve as a depressing example here. For many years now it has been impossible to bring the complex built there up to its full capacity.

It is thought that the creation of a Soviet-U.S. joint venture in West Kazakhstan will make it possible to avoid all these negative phenomena. And the important point here is not only the fact that the "Chevron" concern is famous as one of the largest producers of petroleum refining equipment and therefore the most modern technology will be used in the joint exploitation of the oil field. Our foreign partners' experience in the organization of production, the training of cadres, and the sale of finished products will be equally important.

Nishanov Delegation's Canada Visit Continues

PM0806140390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Morning Edition p4

[TASS report: "Interparliamentary Ties"]

[Text] Ottawa, 7 Jun—The official visit to Canada by a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation led by R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, is continuing. The delegation is in this country at the invitation of the Canadian federal parliament. Members of the delegation have had meetings in the Canadian capital of Ottawa with the leaders of several of the main parliamentary committees.

During one of the meetings, there was a lively exchange of opinions with members of the House of Commons Committee on Ethnic Relations, Questions of Citizenship, and the Affairs of the Indigenous Population. The parliamentarians discussed matters concerning state building and guarantees for the rights of ethnic minorities. It was stressed during the conversations that, because of their multiethnic nature and federative structure, the Soviet Union and Canada have much in common and that the two countries' parliamentarians could learn much that is useful from an exchange of experience in this sphere.

The Soviet parliamentarians took part in a session of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade. There was a detailed discussion about questions concerning German unification. The Canadian side spoke out in favor of incorporating a united Germany into NATO, which, in its opinion, must be reoriented away from military activity toward political activity. The Soviet deputies drew the attention of their Canadian colleagues to the Soviet proposals regarding German demilitarization and the guarantee of security by replacing the system of military blocs with new collective security structures.

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation had a meeting with members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The Soviet parliamentarians met the leaders of the Canadian Senate headed by its speaker, Guy Charbonneau. During the exchange of opinions, the Canadian side underlined its desire to contribute in every way possible to the perestroyka processes in the USSR. The Senate leadership expressed its willingness to promote the development of all-around Soviet-Canadian relations, which were recently given a new boost by the USSR president's state visit to Canada.

The Soviet parliamentarians met the leadership of the authoritative research organization of Canadian business circles, the "Conference Board of Canada," whose members are prominent Canadian companies. They had a lively discussion on possible ways to broaden Soviet-Canadian economic ties.

"The agreements reached during last year's visit to Moscow by Canadian Prime Minister B. Mulroney and the recent visit to Ottawa by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev have placed firm legal foundations under Soviet-Canadian trade and economic relations," the head of the Soviet parliamentary delegation pointed out. "Ships flying the Soviet flag are frequent guests in Canadian ports. But we would like to see them unloading Soviet goods purchased by Canada before they start loading Canadian wheat." "We hope that our Western partners will assist the Soviet Union's planned transition to a regulated market economy," R.N. Nishanov stressed. "If various trade barriers and restrictions on the sale of complex technology were removed, the Soviet Union could make far more rapid progress in this direction."

On 6 June R.N. Nishanov, head of the delegation and chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, was received by Canadian Governor General R. Hnatyshyn. During the conversation, which was sincere and amicable, R. Hnatyshyn highly appraised USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's recent state visit to Canada. He said that the meetings and talks held during the Soviet leader's stay in Ottawa were a major landmark in Soviet-Canadian relations. The importance of actively developing bilateral parliamentary ties, which are an inalienable element of Soviet-Canadian cooperation, was stressed. The governor general confirmed Canada's interest in the success of the perestroyka processes in the USSR and its willingness to offer support, including by means of developing mutually advantageous trade and economic relations. R.N. Nishanov expressed appreciation for the hospitality shown the Soviet parliamentarians in Canada and stressed the Soviet people's desire to further strengthen good neighborly relations and multilateral contacts between the two countries.

The Soviet parliamentarians visited the Canadian parliament and attended a House of Commons session. The announcement by the house speaker that a Soviet parliamentary delegation was in the auditorium was greeted with applause from deputies.

On the same day, the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation had a meeting with the leaders of the Canadian group of the Interparliamentary Union. They exchanged opinions on ways to broaden international ties.

The delegation members visited the Canadian Supreme Court. There was a lively exchange of opinions on progress in implementing legal and juridical reform in the Soviet Union. Bertha Wilson, a member of the Supreme Court, acquainted the Soviet parliamentarians with the structure of Canada's legal bodies and with the composition and main aspects of activity of the Supreme Court.

On Thursday the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation will continue to get to know the workings of various Canadian parliamentary committees.

China

Yazov Talk With Military Delegation Continues

PM0606101590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Jun 90 Second Edition p1

[Unattributed report: "Meeting Held"]

[Text] On 5 June Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, received Colonel General Liu Huaqing, deputy chairman of the PRC Central Military Council and deputy chairman of the CPC Central Committee Military Council, who is in the Soviet Union on a two-week visit at the invitation of the Soviet government.

They had a conversation on questions of mutual interest. They devoted particular attention to Soviet-Chinese military contacts in the context of the ongoing development of USSR-PRC relations.

The following persons took part in the conversation on the Soviet side: Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, commander in chief of the Air Force and USSR

deputy defense minister; and Army General V.M. Shabanov, USSR deputy defense minister. Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR, and other officials took part on the Chinese side.

The meeting proceeded in a warm, friendly atmosphere.

Arms Reduction Along Sino-Soviet Border Viewed

OW1306060090 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 8 Jun 90

[From the "World Today" program]

[Text] Listners: Recently, the Soviet Union and China signed an agreement on reduction of armed forces along their border and enhancement of mutual trust in the military area. In this regard, our reporter Kozlov interviewed Kireyev, a departmental head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

[Kireyev is briefly heard, speaking in Russian, fading to Mandarin translation] Kireyev said: Eliminating military confrontation along the border between the two countries is a major step in improving relations. To this end, and in the interests of the Asia-Pacific region as a whole, the Soviet Union has begun a large-scale, unilateral arms reduction. Since 1985 we have substantially reduced our troops stationed in the Far East and guaranteed that we shall not expand our land- and air-based nuclear weapons deployed there. Moreover, we have destroyed the 436 short- and medium-range missiles in the eastern part of the Soviet Union. By the end of this year, Soviet troops stationed in Asia will be further reduced by 200,000 and work has now commenced to reorganize the troops in the east. The troop reorganization is carried out on the principle that only sufficient troops for defense will be kept.

Kireyev continued: Our country highly values China's unilaterial action to reduce its troops by 1 million. This included troop reduction along the Sino-Soviet border. The constructive steps taken by both sides laid good groundwork for negotiations on the reduction of troops along the border and the strengthening of mutual trust in the military area.

[Kozlov] There seemed to be many controversial issues with regard to the negotiations. How did the two sides solve the issues?

[Kireyev, speaking in Russian, fading to Mandarin translation] Kireyev said: Both sides tried to discuss the issues calmly in an effort to find solutions acceptable to both of them. Of course, each side had its own view. That is natural. But the gap between them might be either widened or narrowed. The characteristic of the Sino-Soviet negotiations was that both tried to seek a common ground not harmful to the interests of either side. Finally, they found the common ground. In my opinion, this was an escalation of mutual trust in the military area.

Reportage on Liu Huaqing Visit to Moscow

Talks With Yazov Viewed

OW1206152090 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Nikolayev commentary from the "World Today" program]

[Text] We have already reported the meeting between Soviet Defense Minister Marshal Yazov and General Liu Huaqing, vice chairman of the Central Military Commission of the PRC, in Moscow. In this regard, station commentator Nikolayev writes as follows:

A visit to the Soviet Union by a Chinese military delegation will surprise no one now. So was the case with the China visit by a Soviet military delegation at the end of May and in early June. Of course, it was the first contact between the two countries' military in several years. When he was young, General Liu Huaqing studied at the naval academy in Leningrad. That was sometime back in the 1950's. His visit to our country this time is by no means for the purpose of restoring the Soviet-Chinese relations at that time. The reason why I want to stress this point is that some Western news media tried in vain to interpret the visit as an intent by the Soviet Union and China to form a military alliance. At the time when the two countries began to normalize their relations, Moscow and Beijing already resolutely announced that their bilateral relations will never be the same as those in the past. It is impossible for the military personnel of the two countries not to get in touch with each other if they want to further improve mutual trust and understanding. The fact that the Soviet Union and China want to reduce troops and arms in their border areas makes it all the more necessary for their military personnel to conduct direct contacts. As is known to everyone, a document in this respect was signed in Moscow not long ago. The mutually accommodating move satisfies not only the Soviet Union and China but also many other countries because it is employing political means to strengthen security and, therefore, makes concrete contributions to relaxing the situation in Asia.

It should be pointed out here that the measures for the Soviet-Chinese border do not touch on any third country and, therefore, will not be detrimental to the interests of any country. Meanwhile, the common experiences shared by the Soviet Union and China in reducing troops and boosting confidence in the military field are very helpful for establishing a process for talks that involve all Asian countries and strengthening security in Asia. It is foreseeable that the development of military cooperation between the Soviet Union and China is going to open up new channels for exchanging experiences in switching the production lines of the war industry to those for manufacturing civilian products. China has achieved a good deal of successful results over the past few years.

Nikolayev says: I believe it is worthwhile for us to learn from China.

Liu Visits Aircraft Plant

OW1306043790 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 9 Jun 90

[From the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] General Liu Huaqing, vice chairman of China's Central Military Commission, who is currently on a visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet Government, visited the (Labor Banner) Machine-Building Plant in Moscow on 8 June.

The foundation stone for the plant was laid in 1909. The plant is famous for making the first aircraft in the Soviet Union. World-famous aircraft designers Zhukovskiy, Chaplygin, and (Veytoshichin) took part in the design of the aircraft. It has become a vanguard of the aircraft-manufacturing industry since the day it was established and has been a leader of the aviation industry in the Soviet Union. In fact, all Soviet aircraft designers have worked in the plant manufacturing the most modern aircraft, including both airliners and military aircraft. In addition to aircraft, the (Labor Banner) Plant produces civilian commodities needed by the people. Mamuyev, president of the (Associated Aviation Production Plant), gave a detailed briefing on the products of the plant and the assembly shop for MiG-29 fighters to the distingushed Chinese guests. The Chinese guests visited the (Glorious Labor) Museum and the Lenin Memorial Hall of the plant. The history of the plant is closely associated with the name of Lenin. [passage omitted]

Touching on cooperation between our two countries back in the 1950's, including that between the aircraft industries, Comrade Liu Huaqing said: [begin recording] They extended every [words indistinct] to us for production of the MiG aircraft, including [words indistinct] aircraft. These various aircraft [words indistinct]. We would like to convey our regards to all the comrades and friends who help us manufacture aircraft, like other countries. At that time, all the friends very willingly helped us [words indistinct] very good. Our Chinese [words indistinct] help in this respect. The contributions made by [words indistinct] comrades are very great. [end recording]

PRC, Taiwan Unification Formulas Compared

PM1206114590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent Yu. Savenkov: "Beijing Rejects 'Elastic Diplomacy'—Relations Broken Off"]

[Text] Beijing—China has suspended diplomatic relations with the Republic of Guinea-Bissau as a sign of protest against the latter's decision to establish diplomatic relations with Taiwan.

This step by the African country, RENMIN RIBAO writes, contravenes the 1974 joint declaration on the establishment of diplomatic relations between China and Guinea-Bissau, which recognized that the PRC government is the sole lawful government representing all the Chinese people, and that the province of Taiwan is an integral part of China.

Observers have turned their attention to the recent energetic steps in "elastic diplomacy" on the part of Taiwan, the essence of which is to consolidate its fairly strong economic trump cards by stepping up its political actions in the world arena. Taiwan is seeking to become a member of the international organizations which it had to leave after Beijing joined them; to open official commercial missions; to raise the level of nongovernmental organizations to that of consulates general; and even to gain official recognition by some countries with which Beijing has diplomatic relations (the case of Guinea-Bissau is already the fifth this year).

Beijing regards this "elastic diplomacy" as negative in the highest degree. It sees it as an attempt to create a "two Chinas" or "one China, one Taiwan" state of affairs, and this would lead to protracting the country's reunification. But let us turn our attention to the explanation by a Chinese government spokesman: "We have never objected to economic, trade, and cultural exchanges with Taiwan which are unofficial in their nature."

A year ago Taipei put forward the concept of "one country—two governments." Observers assessed this as a response to the formula for uniting the country proposed by Beijing: "One country—two systems." To the layman these two formulas sound virtually synonymous. In reality they are conceptually different.

Beijing's formula is based on wide autonomy for Taiwan and the preservation of its socioeconomic system, political structure, way of life, foreign economic autonomy, and even its right to have its own Armed Forces. But the administration must be local, provincial—in short, subordinate to the central authorities in Beijing.

Taipei's formula is deciphered by its authors as follows: Each side has its sovereignty—Beijing on the Chinese mainland, Taipei in Taiwan and the small islands that lie next to it. There are neither leaders nor led, relations are between equals. In the long-term, the authors believe, there will of course be one country with one government, but two governments enjoying equal rights is an ideal model for relations between Beijing and Taipei in the transitional period.

These conditions, for perfectly understandable reasons, do not suit Beijing. The Chinese government's logic is simple: According to international law, only one sovereign government can represent a country. If China has two governments, claims Li Jiaquan, deputy director of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences Taiwan Studies Institute, then one fine day Taiwan may proclaim independence and this, from his viewpoint, will force mainland China to decisively protect (right up to the use of Armed Forces) the country's territorial integrity and

sovereignty. Thus, the academic believes, the Taipei concept in no way brings the country's unification any nearer.

PRC Minister First To Visit Maritime Kray

PM0606124390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Single Edition p 8

[TASS report: "Guests of Maritime Kray"]

[Text] Vladivostok, 1 Jun—China's Minister of Commerce Hu Ping has arrived on a visit to Maritime Kray, the first PRC government member to do so.

"Our ties have become stronger, especially over the last two years," he said at a meeting with Soviet leaders and representatives of the kray's business circles, held in Vladivostok today. "Just take for example the fact that 4,000 Chinese workers have found themselves employed in your Maritime Kray. The expanding rights of local self-government in the USSR offer good prospects for cooperation."

The aim of the visit was to examine opportunities for the development of contacts. It is a typical fact that the volume of trade channeled through the Maritime Kray Potrebsoyuz [Union of Consumer Trade Cooperatives] alone has risen from 1.2 million Swiss francs in 1987 to 71 million Swiss francs in 1989.

Supervision Ministry Delegation Visits

PM1106114990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Guests From the PRC"]

[Text] A delegation from the PRC Ministry of Supervision headed by Minister Wei Jianxing was in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR People's Control Committee.

During the visit there was a broad exchange of opinions on questions of strengthening control work in conditions of economic reforms.

Chinese Provincial Delegation Arrives Moscow

LD1106134390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0825 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow 11 June (TASS)—A delegation from the people's government of the Chinese province of Jilin, headed by Wang Zhongyu, chairman of the government, arrived here today for an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers.

The program for the visit includes meetings between the visitors and the leadership of the Russian Council of Ministers and talks in the republic's foreign ministry. After Moscow, the delegation will visit Leningrad and Irkutsk, and will pay a visit to the Maritime Kray.

Discusses Ties

LD1206165690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 12 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A delegation of the people's government of the Chinese province of Jilin is in our country at the invitation of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers on an official friendly visit. The delegation was today received by Gorshkov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. During the course of a conversation the state of and prospects for the development of friendly ties and trade and economic cooperation between the Russian Federation and Jilin Province were analyzed. The sides spoke in favor of increasing the volume of local and border trade and of more active cooperation in the field of rail, motor vehicle, and river transport.

The heads of a number of Russian ministries and departments took part in the conversation. [video shows meeting]

Northeast Asia

Shevardnadze To Visit Japan in September

AU1106090690 Paris AFP in English 0852 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Tokyo, June 11 (AFP)—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze is to visit Japan in early September ahead of President Mikhail Gorbachev's first visit to the country next year, a Foreign Ministry official said Monday.

The Soviet foreign minister, who last visited Japan in December 1988, is expected to discuss details of Mr. Gorbachev's upcoming visit as well as an unresolved territorial dispute between the two countries.

The failure to resolve the dispute, involving four Soviet-held islands north of Japan, has prevented the two countries from signing a formal peace treaty.

Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev denied in Tokyo over the weekend that Mr. Gorbachev had hinted to Mr. Bush during the summit that Moscow was ready to offer a new deal to Japan to resolve the issue.

Supreme Soviet Delegation Arrives in Japan

LD0706074690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0500 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] Tokyo, 7 Jun (TASS)—A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet arrived in Japan today. It is led by N.N. Danilyuk, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Khabarovsk Kray Soviet of People's Deputies. The delegation, whose members are drawn from the USSR Supreme Soviet group for contacts with the Japanese parliament, will take part in a congress of

the parliamentary Japanese-Soviet Friendship Association. The program of the visit, which will last untill 13 June, also includes meetings with representatives of both houses of the Japanese parliament and leaders of Japanese political parties.

Rogachev Briefs Japanese Officials on Summit

LD1006005690 Moscow TASS in English 1813 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Tokyo June 9 TASS—In Tokyo today, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev informed the leadership of the Japanese Foreign Ministry of the main results of the Soviet-American summit.

Japanese spokesmen welcomed the building of confidence and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States and highly appreciated the disarmament accords reached at the summit in Washington, particularly the finalisation of coordinating the basic provisions of a treaty on a 50 per cent cuts in strategic offensive arms and main parameters of the next phase of talks on strategic offensive arms and strategic stability.

The Japanese side emphasized that the constructive dialogue between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush promotes not only the development of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States but also an improvement of the overall international climate.

Soviet-Japanese relations, the situation in the Asia-Pacific Region, primarily the Cambodian settlement process and the situation on the Korean Peninsula, were discussed during consultations, in which Takakazu Kuriyama, Japanese first deputy foreign minister, took part.

Japan's Proposal for Asian Meeting Discussed

OW1006113290 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Nikolayev commentary: "Prospects for the Development of the All-Asia Undertaking"]

[Text] Sources from Tokyo report that the Japanese foreign minister has called for a conference of the foreign ministers of Asian countries. He says this move is necessary to usher in an Asian era. A mediation mechanism involving all countries to discuss the urgent issues is, indeed, a realistic need. In this regard, station commentator Nikolayev writes as follows:

The Soviet Union is one of the few countries that has taken the lead in initiating a proposal for establishing a system for security and cooperation throughout Asia. Gorbachev made a proposal in Vladivostok more than two years ago about holding a conference of Pacific countries to take advantage of European experiences. He specifically talked about the proposal in Krasnoyarsk two years later. The purpose is to establish a mechanism for holding talks in the region as soon as possible in order that the naval superpowers in the Asia - Pacific region may begin to negotiate with each other about not conducting naval expansion, and so that the Soviet Union, China, Japan, the DPRK, and South Korea may discuss the issue of reducing the level of military confrontation in the coastal areas. He called for convening an international conference on turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. He also called for convening a conference of foreign ministers of Asian countries to discuss preliminary measures for establishing a new type of relations in the Asia - Pacific region.

The proposal put forward by Japan is very similar to the one put forward by the Soviet Union. Not long ago, Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu called for convening a peace conference of the Asia - Pacific region. The United States, Australia, and other countries are also taking measures to establish an oriental structure in the region. It should be pointed out that recently a number of U.S. congressmen proposed the establishment of a Pacific region forum on the basis of the establishment of an economic forum of the Asia - Pacific region proposed by Prime Minister Hawke to facilitate discussions between leaders of all countries about commerce, development, security, and detente. It seems this can create a better foundation for establishing a mechanism for talks among all countries.

However, regrettably, this is still a far cry from really making concerted efforts. Some people say it is necessary to eliminate conflicts, while others suggest forming a bloc that shuts others out. The crux of the matter lies not in forming a bloc, but in urging every country to make joint efforts to solve problems on the basis of equality, mutual benefit, and balanced interests. Wouldn't this be much better? The experience in Europe provides a distinct example. The Soviet leadership still abides by the plans laid down in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk. The meeting between the presidents of the Soviet Union and the United States has confirmed this point. Moscow does not want to insist on using its pattern to solve the problems in the Asia - Pacific region. We suggest conducting dialogue with the countries that intend to open up the way to the resources in Asia.

RSFSR, Japan Prefecture Establish Friendship

OW0906104490 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Friendly relations were established between the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and Japan's Oita Prefecture in Moscow on 7 June. (Shchigarov), deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and Oita Prefectural Governor Morihiko Hiramatsu exchanged statements on the friendly relations between the RSFSR and Oita Prefecture.

The statements read: The RSFSR and Oita Prefecture will expand relations and cooperation based on mutual benefits in the fisheries, forestry, agricultural, industrial and other sectors, and promote technological and industrial development as well as exchanges in the fields of culture, education, and sport.

After exchanging the statements, Deputy Chairman (Shchigarov) and Governor Hiramatstu attended a news conference and stressed the importance of promoting Soviet-Japanese cooperation at the regional level.

Kaifu Cited on Economic Aid, Kurils

LD1006133790 Moscow TASS in English 1329 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Tokyo June 10 TASS—Japan will promote perestroyka in the Soviet economy in an active and balanced way, Japanese Premier Toshiki Kaifu said in the city of Fukuoka.

He welcomed the Soviet leadership's policy aimed at the early transition to a market economy and expressed hope for the establishment of firm and stable relations with the Soviet Union.

At the same time, speaking about the problem of "northern territories"—part of the Kuril Islands, to which Japan lays claims, he said that "we will not put off the solution of this problem."

According to local observers, this was Kaifu's first statement, in which he clearly expressed Japan's positive attitude to the rendering of economic aid to the Soviet Union.

Cooperation Agreement Signed With ROK

LD1206120590 Moscow TASS in English 1159 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 12 TASS—A visiting delegation from the South Korean Foreign Trade Association today signed an agreement on cooperation with the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

Vladimir Golanov, deputy chairman of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, told TASS that the Soviet Union's economic and trading cooperation with South Korea now takes place on the basis of an agreement with the non-governmental South Korean organisation Kotra.

The situation in Soviet-South Korean business relations requires a broader legal base. The agreement signed today envisages the exchange of information and delegations, the holding of seminars and training of Soviet specialists in South Korea.

The delegation of the Foreign Trade Association of South Korea visited various Soviet ministries and agencies, foreign trade organisations, as well as industrial enterprises in Moscow and Leningrad. Dr. Nam Duck-Woo, [name as received] who was once finance minister and prime minister of South Korea, and who is the association's chairman and head of the delegation, believes that these meetings were extremely useful.

He said that direct trade between the two countries is growing every year, and that joint activity on the implementation of most up-to-date Soviet projects is of interest to the South Korean business.

The area of finance remains closed so far, since there is no appropriate agreement between the Soviet Union and South Korea. Nevertheless, there are good prospects for Soviet-South Korean business ties. This was noted at the recent meeting of the heads of the two states in San Francisco.

High-Level Contacts With ROK Reviewed

LD0906022590 Moscow World Service in English 0610 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] The first ever top level contact between the Soviet Union and South Korea has evoked much international comment. The leadership of the Peoples' Democratic Republic of Korea is keeping silent on the Gorbachev-No Tae-u talks. On their eve Pyongyang warned that they would have serious political repurcussions.

On Wednesday [6 June] the North Korean newspaper NODONG SINMUN bitterly criticized the policy of two Koreas, which admits the existence of the two states on the Koran peninsula. The criticism was formally targetted at the United States. On Thursday the North Korean NEWS AGENCY circulated a statement by the so-called South Korean National Democratic Front based in Tokyo, which has close ties with Pyongyang. The statement describes the talks between the Soviet and South Korean presidents as unforgiveable treacherous bargaining. No Tae-u, the statement says, is ready to cringe even to the Soviet Union. That is the only mention of the Soviet Union in the statement.

The talks have aroused interest in Beijing. Observers there believe China would like a closer relationship with South Korea. The trade between the two countries has already hit three billion dollars a year, while Beijing's trade with Pyongyang stands at an annual 562 million dollars. But according to REUTERS the Chinese first want to see how North Korea will react to a similar rapprochement between Seoul and Moscow.

In America the Department of State hailed the meeting and gave resolute support to attempts by No Tae-u to establish ties with socialist countries. There has been some speculation as to the agreements that the meeting produced. REUTERS has quoted a high-placed South Korean official as saying that the two countries will establish diplomatic relations in August and the heads of state will exchange reconciliatory visits before the end of this year. These reports have been flatly denied by sources close to the Soviet president.

Observers have also pointed to the statement by No Tae-u that he and Gorbachev agreed to facilitate reforms(?s) in North Korea. Sources close to Gorbachev reaffirmed the Soviet Union's commitment to noninterference in the affairs of sovereign states.

ROK Committee To Promote Economic Cooperation

LD1206093490 Moscow TASS in English 0909 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Yegorov]

[Text] Tokyo June 12 TASS—The South Korean Government has decided to set up a special committee for economic cooperaiton with the Soviet Union. The decision has been adopted today at a regular meeting of the Cabinet of Ministers which discussed general questions of Soviet-South Korean economic relations.

The new mixed committee consisting of government representatives, representatives of public organisations and businessmen will regulate commercial and economic contacts of South Korean firms with Soviet partners to avoid excessive competition of individual companies seeking to put their goods on the huge Soviet market.

Radio Liberty Distorts Ties With ROK

LD1106182790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1229 GMT 11 Jun 90

[By TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov]

[Text] Moscow, 11 Jun (TASS)—The international press, continuing to discuss the results of Mikhail Gorbachev's brief conversation in San Francisco with No Tae-u, president of South Korea, notes that as a result another important step has been taken in the development of the concept, put forward by the USSR, of Asian-Pacific security and the strengthening of peace in the region.

Radio Liberty, based in Munich (FRG), has commented on the conversation, but in its own, particular manner. Quoting a TASS observer's statement that the line of the expansion not only of economic contacts but also of political dialogue with South Korea "does not signify and indeed cannot signify abandoning our fundamental positions and priorities, consigning the interests of third countries to oblivion," Radio Liberty attacks TASS for allegedly advocating...good and friendly relations with the DPRK. According to the logic of the analysts of Munich, Moscow should "make its choice:" either Pyongyang or Seoul.

A strange "logic," to put it bluntly! If one follows the postulates propounded by Radio Liberty, it turns out that any opting for political dialogue, bringing positive results in one direction, must inevitably engender tension in another. And if one particular state activiates economic and other links with another state, then this perfectly natural process must inevitably be pursued to the detriment of the other country.

It is not hard to realize that at the basis of such confrontational reasoning lies certainly no desire for an improvement in the situation in the region, or a solution to the problems which have accumulated there. At their basis lies a desire to complicate the constructive political dialogue, one of whose aims is to promote the peaceful unification of Korea, a desire to sow seeds of suscpicion and mistrust between different countries and peoples.

Some people in the West really would like, by distorting the gist and bias of Soviet-South Korean relations, to try to disinform people, to drive a wedge into the traditionally friendly relations between Moscow and Pyongyang. This is not the first time such attempts have been made, incidentally, and they have not hitherto yielded their authors any dividends. Nor will they, undoubtedly, this time either....

Army Delegation Visits North Korea

SK0806062790 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 4 Jun 90

[From the "Annals of Cooperation" program]

[Text] A delegation of Soviet Army political functionaries visited the DPRK recently. Vice Marshal O Chin-u, minister of the Ministry of the People's Armed Forces, received the delegation.

During the meeting, they discussed [words indistinct] of the party political work of the Soviet Army and the People's Army of the DPRK.

The Soviet Army political functionaries talked about [passage indistinct] and preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress.

The delegation visited a series of units of the Korean People's Army and acquainted themselves with soldiers' lives and their combat exercises. The delegation also inspected the Kim Il-song Military and Political College.

News Conference Held at DPRK Embassy in Moscow

SK0806062990 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 4 Jun 90

[From the "Annals of Cooperation" program]

[Text] The DPRK Embassy in the Soviet Union has held a press conference for Soviet reporters on the successes of the first session of the ninth Supreme People's Assembly of the DPRK. Comrade (Kim Su-ik), the DPRK charge d'affaires ad interim to the Soviet Union, introduced to the participants of the press conference the theses of DPRK President Comrade Kim Il-song's policy address. New proposals for the reunification of Korea were presented at the conference.

The charge d'affaires ad interim thanked representatives from the Soviet mass media for their objective news coverage of events in the DPRK and the situation on the Korean peninsula.

Effort for Detente in Asia Emphasized

SK1206062690 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Station commentator (Oleg Alekseyev) commentary; "Soviet-U.S. Dialogue and the Asian and Pacific Region" from the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] As was made known, the question of security in the Asian and Pacific region was not a priority topic at the Soviet-U.S. summit which ended several days ago. The result of the summit, however, is most directly linked with that question.

Our station commentator (Oleg Alekseyev) says:

First of all, I would like to note that the Soviet-U.S. treaty which would be concluded for the reduction of 50 percent of the strategic arms would become a document of global significance. A complete agreement was reached at the summit over the basic principles of the treaty.

First, the treaty envisages a drastic reduction of the nuclear danger. This, of course, is linked with all countries and peoples, including those in the Asian and Pacific region.

Second, as has been made known, the treaty would also make a beginning to sharply reducing strategic nuclear means from Asia, which are presently deployed there in great quantity. This means that the treaty, when it is concluded, will constitute a practical and great contribution to strengthening security in the Asian and Pacific region.

However, the problem is that the Soviet-U.S. agreement is not sufficient as a contribution to reducing nuclear danger throughout the world, including the Asian and Pacific region.

The talks held between the Presidents of the Soviet Union and United States directed great attention to the conflicts in Afghanistan and Cambodia, to the dangerous situation on the nearby peninsula, and to finding a most appropriate way to settle the situation in the Near East, all of which are detrimental to peace. In addition, the exchange of views was very constructive and, according to commentators, was very favorable for peace in the Asian and Pacific region.

In this connection, I would like to note that the Soviet Union attaches great importance to strengthening the work of notably easing tension in the Asian and Pacific region.

As Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out at his joint press conference with the U.S. President, many things have already been done in this direction. For example, medium- and short-range missiles have been liquidated in Asia; changes have taken place along the border with China; the Soviet troops have been pulled out of Afghanistan; and the Vietnamese troops have been withdrawn from Cambodia.

In this connection, I would like to remind you of the plan to unilaterally reduce 200,000 troops in the eastern regions of the country.

At the same time, the Soviet military presence at Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam has been remarkably reduced.

As for the future, the outcome of the meeting held between Mikhail Gorbachev and the ROK President No Tae-u in San Francisco is also promising.

However, it is still too early to reach a conclusion that an extensive process of detente has begun in the Asian and Pacific region. This is because there is, first of all, a need for a mechanism of conferences toward this end, as is attested by the experience in Europe and by the overall international experience. Only within that framework can the question of strengthening security be comprehensively settled.

Regrettably, however, there has appeared no such sign in the Asian and Pacific region. This is a serious obstacle. This is because easing tension, in its essence, is not a one-way street. Easing tension requires a constructive joint effort of all countries concerned.

In this connection, signs have recently begun to appear for a beginning of work after the standstill.

For example, the proposal for a pan-Asian conference, which Japanese Foreign Minister Nakayama put forth a few days ago to discuss the regional issues, is a step forward in this direction.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

'Importance' of Situation in Asia-Pacific Region

OW1006022290 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Alekseyev commentary from the "Asian Affairs and Situation" program]

[Text] As everyone knows, the issue of security in Asia-Pacific Region is not the first item on the agenda for the current Soviet-U.S. summit. However, the results of the summit will be closely related to the issue. In this regard, station observer Alekseyev writes as follows.

First of all, I would like to point out that the agreement which the Soviet Union and the United States will soon sign on reducing offensive strategic weapons by 50 percent is a global document. Its basic principles have already been completely decided through consultation during the summit. The agreement, first of all, refers to largely reducing nuclear danger. Of course, this agreement concerns all countries and their peoples, including those in the Asia-Pacific Region. Second, the agreement sets the stage for the beginning the destruction of strategic nuclear arms en masse. There are quite a lot of these weapons in Asia. The Soviet-U.S. agreement contributes to reducing the extent of nuclear danger everywhere in the world, including the Asia-Pacific region.

The presidents of the two countries also attached great importance to exploring the best plans for mediating the Afghan and Cambodian conflicts and toward easing tensions and dangerous situations in the Indochina peninsula and Near East, as these regional conflicts pose a threat to reconciliation and peace. Moreover, their exchange of views is very constructive and, in the opinion of our observer, also very conducive toward achieving peace in the Asia-Pacific Region.

Taking advantage of this opportunity, I wish to point out that the Soviet Union attaches importance to accelerating the process of easing tensions in the Asia-Pacific region to a great extent. As Gorbachev pointed out at the joint press conference held with the president of the United States: A great deal of work has been done in this regard, such as the destruction of the medium- and short-range missiles deployed in Asia, the changes taking place along the Soviet-Chinese border, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan and Vietnamese troops from Cambodia, and so forth. Here I would also like to mention that the Soviet Union unilaterally reduced the troops in the eastern part of the country by 200,000 and has largely reduced the number of its troops stationed in Cam Ranh Bay, Vietnam.

If we speak of prospects, then the outcome of the talks between Gorbachev and South Korean President No Tae-U is also encouraging. However, it would be premature to say that a large-scale thaw and detente has begun in the Asia-Pacific region. Accumulated international experiences, including those acquired in Europe, show that a mechanism for holding talks is needed to solve all the problems relating to strengthening security. There is presently no such mechanism in the Asia-Pacific region. This is, undoubtedly, a big obstacle, as detente in its intrinsic quality cannot possibly be one-sided and requires coordination and constructive efforts from every country. However, there have been signs recently that the Asia-Pacific region is also moving in this direction. For instance, the proposal made by Japanese Foreign Minister Nakayama on holding a conference with the participation of all the countries in Asia is a step in this direction.

Current Situation in Philippines Viewed

HK1306050390 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Commentary by Vassiliy Filipov]

[Text] Philippine Independence Day came at the dawn of the century, when vast changes were going on in Asian history. Even though the Philippines was the very first republic to be declared in Asia, its history has not always been a happy one. Its record during past the 90 years has been a difficult one, with the wounds left by Spain still festering, and dependence on the United States still evident.

The Philippines operates under a feudal system of land ownership, with the majority of landowners being the ones running the country. This group is responsible for sabotaging the Aquino government's agrarian reform program, which was the president's main platform when she was campaigning for the presidency. If the program could be implemented, this would increase the country's purchasing power and would revitalize industries. However, instead of achieving this, failure has been evident, with only some 300,000 hectares of agricultural land having been given thus far to the farmers.

With some 1 million landless farmers and a small number of landowners, the gap between the two sectors is indeed a glaring one.

Meanwhile, the Aquino government is endeavoring to promote a livelihood program to try to heal the wounds caused by the excesses of the 20-year reign of President Marcos. However, the situation has become difficult with the fall in the prices of the country's traditional products and the strengthening of trade barriers put up by the developed countries. Since the Philippine Government is in dire need of funds, its foreign debt has increased because of new loans obtained to finance its economic and social programs.

Meanwhile, investors planning to set up businesses have been in two minds because of the Philippines' unstable political situation, especially in view of the series of coup d'etats mounted by some elements of the Armed Forces. Therefore investors have turned to the more stable countries like Malaysia, Thailand, and Indonesia.

The Philippine experience is one which cries out for stability and improved conditions to combat society's ills, particularly graft and corruption.

On this day when the Philippines observes its Independence Day in the wake of political tensions, pressure will continue to be exerted by the Americans on the issue of their bases. The agreement on this expires in 1991; and it is becoming clear that although recent positive changes render those bases irrelevant, the United States still wishes to retain them. The reason given for this is that the bases provide jobs for many Filipinos and are a major source of funds for the Philippine Government.

Filipinos are polarized on the issue of the bases. The Lower House is in favor of extending the bases treaty, while the Senate is opposed to this. It will be recalled that talks between Manila and Washington ended in stalemate recently; they will be resumed in August.

As Independence Day is being observed today, the authorities are on the alert because of groups of extremists which threaten to make trouble. But, as announced by officials, nothing will be allowed to disrupt the Independence Day celebrations.

The hope among the people endures, as it did during the time of General Emilio Aguinaldo, when he declared Philippine Independence Day in Kawit, Cavite, 92 years ago.

Indonesian Delegation Pays Official Visit

Cooperation Discussed

LD1106131490 Moscow TASS in English 1307 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—Jakarta's contribution to the lowering of international tension, overcoming of regional conflicts and mitigation of global problems is highly appreciated in the Soviet Union. Ivan Laptev, chairman of the Council of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said this today in Moscow when he received a delegation of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia. It is staying in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the supreme body of state authority.

Cooperation of the two countries' parliaments, economic and cultural cooperation were discussed. It was noted that there is a need to create a mechanism promoting stabilisation in the Asia-Pacific region.

Indonesian Ambassador to the USSR Djanwr Marah was present at the meeting of parliamentarians which passed in an open atmosphere.

Lukyanov Briefs Delegation

LD1106212190 Moscow TASS in English 2029 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Lukyanov received an Indonesian parliamentary delegation led by speaker of the House of Representatives Mohamed Kharis Suhud, on Monday. The delegation is in the USSR on an official visit.

Lukyanov briefed the Indonesian delegation on the activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet and pointed to the organic link between the success of perestroyka in the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union's constructive efforts on the international arena in the spirit of new political thinking.

He also characterised the main results of the Soviet-American summit in Washington.

Speaking about the situation in the Asia-Pacific region, Lukyanov emphasised that most countries of the region had distinctly demonstrated their anti-nuclear and anti-base attitudes and intentions to establish security and settle regional conflicts by political means.

For his part, Mohamed Suhud spoke about Indonesia's tasks on the current stage of national development, the structure and activities of the house of Representatives and focused on priorities of Indonesia's foreign policy.

Indonesian parliamentarians displayed live interest in the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet and spoke in favour of establishing equal cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region.

Both sides pointed out the importance of contacts between senior officials of the two countries for advancing Soviet-Indonesian relations that reached a turning point during the summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and President Suharto in September 1989. Suhud conveyed an invitation to the leadership of the USSR Supreme Soviet to pay an official visit to Indonesia. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

Near East & South Asia

Gorbachev's Personal Representative Visits Egypt

Envoy Received By Mubarak

LD1106154390 Moscow TASS in English 1318 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Cairo, June 11 TASS—President Husni Mubarak of Egypt today received Mikhail Gorbachev's personal representative V. Polyakov who conveyed to him a verbal message from the Soviet president.

The message deals with the results of the recent Soviet-American summit.

Envoy Briefs Mubarak on Summit

LD1206130890 Moscow TASS in English 1258 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Cairo June 12 TASS—President Husni Mubarak of Egypt received on Monday Vladimir Polyakov, a personal envoy of the Soviet president, who briefed him on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit.

The Soviet envoy stressed that Soviet-U.S. summits are increasingly turning into an international orientation point of stability and progress.

The two men focused on the Middle East situation and specially emphasised the need to pool efforts to normalise the situation in the region, to launch the peace process as soon as possible. Anxiety was expressed over the fact that the continued tension and the build up of the arms race in the region seriously undermine international security.

The participants spoke out in favour of the peaceful, constructive policy of the Palestinian Liberation Movement (PLO), aimed at exercising national rights including the right to self-determination within the framework of a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

On the question of immigrant resettlement on the occupied Arab territories, it was stressed that the policy and practice of the Israeli Government on this question contradicted norms of international law and that Israel should heed the deep concern in this connection shown by the international community.

The conversation also focused on a number of international and bilateral issues.

Deputy Foreign Minister Petrovskiy Visits Iraq

Arrives in Baghdad for Talks

LD1006091190 Moscow TASS in English 0845 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Baghdad June 10 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy has arrived in the Iraqi capital to hold political consultations with the Iraqi leadership.

The two sides will discuss Middle East issues and the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 598 providing for the solution of the Iran-Iraq conflict and the establishment of durable peace in the region.

Meets With Husayn, 'Arafat

LD1206131390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0724 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Baghdad, 12 June (TASS)—F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, visited Baghdad on 10 and 11 June. He was received by S. Husayn, president of Iraq. They had a long conversation during which the Soviet representative reported on the results of the meeting between the USSR and U.S. leaders in Washington. President S. Husayn spoke highly of the results of this meeting, noting the active and principled line of the Soviet leader in discussing Near East affairs. There was a detailed exchange of opinions on issues concerning the situation in the region. The Soviet side noted the weighty results of the recent Baghdad extraordinary conference of heads of state and government of Arab countries and the constructive nature of the decisions adopted at it, which are intended to guarantee a just and all-embracing solution of the problems of the Near East.

In discussing Soviet-Iraqi relations, the sides noted their mutually advantageous nature and spoke in favor of seeking new forms of co-operation. There was also a conversation with T 'Aziz, Iraq's foreign minister, during which there was a comprehensive examination of the situation in the Near East. Particular emphasis was placed on the need to consolidate Arab ranks in the interests of strengthening peace and stability in the region. Questions relating to the Iran-Iraq settlement were examined.

V. V. Posuvalyuk, USSR ambassador to Iraq, took part in the conversations.

On the instructions of M. S. Gorbachev, USSR president, V. F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, met here Y. 'Arafat, Palestinian head of state and chairman of the PLO Executive Committee, and informed him about the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit talks in Washington.

After positively assessing the results of M S Gorbachev's visits to the United States, Y 'Arafat expressed gratitude to the Soviet leader for what he said in the United States in support of the just cause of the Palestinian people.

In discussing Near East problems, both sides noted the danger of escalating tension in the region and said there is a need for urgent action to start up a mechanism for a Near East settlement, including UN involvement.

V. V. Posuvalyuk, USSR ambassador to Iraq, took part in the conversation.

Protection of Emigres to Israel Affirmed

TA1206195790 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1500 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Commentary by Dmitriy Prokofyev—read by announcer]

[Text] Ahmad Jibril, the secretary general of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command, said that his organization is planning terrorist attacks against Soviet immigrants to Israel. This was reported by the British THE INDEPENDENT ON SUNDAY. The paper recalls that several days ago, Major General Amnon Shahaq, the head of the Israeli Intelligence Branch, warned that USSR immigrants could be the targeted victims of terrorist attacks. This is what our commentator Dmitriy Prokofyev has to say about the matter:

Ahmad Jibril, a PLO renegade, bets on terrorism. [Word indistinct] unequivocal terrorism: Any armed attack against civilians is an act of terrorism and should be regarded as such. The impression is that he plans to carry out these acts of terror on Soviet soil or on the territory of other Warsaw Pact countries offering transit services to Jews immigrating to Israel. When these immigrants are already in Israel, it would be beneficial to differentiate them from the rest of the citizens. [sentence as heard] Incidentally, another terrorist organization calling itself the Arab Rejectionist Front has already launched terrorist attacks against the citizens of East European countries that provide assistance for Soviet emigrants in transit. The Arab Rejectionist Front members attacked Polish diplomats, attacked and burned the Romanian Embassy building in Beirut with rockets, and planted a bomb on board a Malev aircraft.

Naturally, the countries threatened by extremist Palestinian and Lebanese terrorism will not sit still. The Soviet Union and its allies in the Warsaw Pact have sufficient means to protect their territory against any attempted attack. I also hope that those Middle East countries which currently provide the terrorist organizations with camps for training and buildings for their commands—and we know very well which countries they are—understand the consequences the armed provocations of their proteges will have on ties with Eastern countries.

Terrorism is the red line which no enlightened country can afford to cross.

Yet Israel, too, must learn the lesson from this emerging situation. It may very well be that there are some people in Jerusalem who are pleased to see the radical Arabs finally harming relations between the Arab world and the USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries. But what about the price insofar as Israel is concerned? After all, the terrorists plan attacks against Israeli citizens. Besides, the responsibility for the radicalization among the Arab extremists lies also with the Israeli leadership. The refusal of the Israeli Government to conduct any negotiations whatsoever with the moderates in the PLO, [word indistinct] supporting a political solution to the Palestinian issue, merely strengthens criminals such as Jibril and instigators such as Abu-al-'Abbas [Muhammad 'Abbas], or Islamic fundamentalists belonging to the Arab Rejectionist Front.

It is as clear as day that the deeds and [word indistinct] of the Palestinian terrorists constitute the epitome of irresponsibility and seriously harm the Arab struggle. Yet Israeli readiness to enter into a dialogue with the moderates in the PLO is also required to invalidate the terrorists' arguments.

Moscow Sees Chance for Peace Under Shamir

TA1106200090 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1500 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Commentary by Dmitriy Prokofyev]

[Text] The report on the formation of the new Israeli Government under Yitzhak Shamir based on a coalition of the Likud and the religious and rightist parties has won front-page headlines in the U.S. press. This is a victory of those forces in Israel that object to the U.S. desire to bring the Jewish state and the Palestinians to the negotiating table, says THE WASHINGTON POST. There is special danger in the new Israeli Government's clear aspiration to expand the settlements, says THE NEW YORK TIMES. CBS-TV claims that the current government is the most extreme right-wing government since the establishment of the Jewish state.

Has the Middle East peace process again been deadlocked?

Our correspondent Dmitriy Prokofeyv wrote the following on this issue:

Evidently it would not be right to conclude that the opinion of the U.S. press is the final word. In general, the press tends to overdramatize events. The U.S. Administration's attitude toward what happened in Jerusalem is far more restrained. President Bush reaffirmed Washington's readiness to cooperate with the new government as well as promote the political process. At the same time, it warned that the administration is not prepared to accept attempts to sabotage the chances for a regional settlement, no matter who initiates them. I believe the hint is pretty clear and that Jerusalem understood it fully.

Incidentally, the new government's foreign policy plan is not fundamentally different from the Likud-Alignment plan. Here, too, there was an affirmation of adherence to the Camp David agreements; there is readiness to work on the basis of the Shamir-Rabin peace initiative, broached a year ago.

If we base ourselves on the clarifications issued by Mr. Moshe Arens last night, then it appears that the Likud has managed to convince the extreme rightist parties that joined the coalition that their recommendations on ways to resolve the Palestinian problem are not only unrealistic but furthermore are dangerous for the Jewish state.

The above has also been proved by the fact that Roni Milo was suggested as police affairs minister and Moshe Arens is the defense minister-designate. These are two men who are considered moderates in the Likud camp.

Nevertheless, there are some grounds for concern for two reasons: the first, the new government's intention to resume the settlement momentum. Regardless of the scope of this campaign—and I presume it will be rather limited because the government has no money and the settlement organizations have no new activists—the psychological effect of even the mere expression of readiness to build new settlements triggers a very sharp reaction among the Arabs. That is not hard to understand, because the Arabs regard all new settlements in the territories as an attempt to drive the Palestinians away and to send them to the neighboring countries where they are, in any case, a source of instability.

The second source of danger is that we must not forget that although the Israeli initiative of a year ago was a very important step in the direction of peace, it was nonetheless insufficient. In other words, by submitting the Shamir-Rabin initiative, Israel traveled an important distance but has still failed to meet the Arabs halfway.

Until recently, neither Egypt nor the other moderate Arab regimes stirred up an emotional reaction against the Israeli Government's initiative. I presume they would have hoped that in the final analysis the Alignment would call the shots. As it embraces flexible positions and one can talk to it, it is possible to reach a compromise agreement with it. The Likud, on the other hand, is perceived as a far more intransigent partner. Consequently, the Arab reaction may also be far more rigid.

I can only hope that the Likud leadership will try to prevent unnecessary conflicts because ultimately it will not only be in the interests of the Arabs, of peace in the Middle East, and of the superpowers, but first and foremost in the interest of the State of Israel and the Israeli people to have peace.

Hashemi-Rafsanjani on Western Hostages Issue

PM0806132590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Statement by President of Iran"]

[Text] New York, 7 Jun—President Hashemi-Rafsanjani of Iran has stated at a press conference in Teheran that Iran "seriously wishes the liberation of all the Western hostages detained in Lebanon," although the United States is hampering the settlement of the question by its "irresponsible conduct", ABC TV reports. "The door is open if the United States wants this," he said.

The TV company reports that for the first time the Iranian president named the specific condition for the continuation of help in the affair of the hostages detained by pro-Iranian groupings. ABC notes that the settlement of this question is of great importance for Hashemi-Rafsanjani because the Iranian economy is experiencing serious difficulties. In the TV company's opinion, Iran hopes that help in freeing the Western hostages will open the way for it to obtain loans and foreign capital investments.

Moscow Comments on Tehran-Baghdad Exchange

NC0806095090 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] The members of the Persian Gulf Cooperation Council participating in the two-day al-Ta'if conference have praised the exchange of diplomatic messages between Tehran and Baghdad. They believe that Iraqi President Saddam Husayn's proposal for a meeting between the Iranian and Iraqi leaders, which has been accepted by Hojjat ol-Eslam 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, the Iranian president, gives rise to hopes and optimism.

Our commentator writes: The satisfaction expressed by the representatives of the Persian Gulf states on the wish of Tehran and Baghdad to move toward understanding is comprehensible because this gives a real prospect of an emergence, under UN supervision, from the stalemate in the Iran-Iraq peace talks. The continuation of the stalemate threatens the rekindling of the confrontation which would have negative impacts on the entire region.

We wish to point out that the war inflicted immense tragedies and casualties on the Iranian and Iraqi people. But other countries were harmed by it as well. Kuwaiti territory was the target of missile attacks. Cargo ships and tankers belonging to the littoral Arab countries of the Gulf were attacked from the sea and from the air. Conflict broke out between Iranian and Saudi Arabian fighters, and Iranian oil exploration establishments in the Persian Gulf and its coast were incessantly bombed by the Iraqi Air Force.

These are examples of the direct effects and repercussions of the combat operations in the area. However, economic and political damage was also inflicted. The war caused relations between Iran and the Arabs to deteriorate. It created many problems, among which we can point to the longstanding conflicts and differences between Tehran and Riyadh on the quota of Iranian Hajj pilgrims [words indistinct].

[passage indistinct] But it is obvious that peace is needed first and foremost by the Iranians and Iraqis who are concerned over a halt in the favorable process of events toward a future meeting. This concern emanates from the fact that some high-ranking officials in Iran are expressing doubts over the need for talks between the leaders of the two countries. They also allege that the recent Arab summit in Baghdad expressed support for Baghdad's claims of sovereignty over the Shatt al-'Arab, or Arvand Rud.

I think that this is not a very convincing reason to refrain from the meeting. The question of whether or not such a vital point as sovereignty over the border river can be sorted out in a mutually acceptable fashion can be decided only through talks between the two presidents. Saying that they will meet with prepared solutions in hand manifests naivete. It is also obvious that the leaders of the two countries should discuss the issue of the border river within an expanded framework of a solution to the problem by bearing in mind the outlook for what expanded relations between the two countries could achieve in times of peace.

Both countries need cooperation, and the Shatt al-'Arab can facilitate this cooperation. The river could be opened to navigation and for the transport of agricultural and oil products of both Iran and Iraq. It is a favorable means for exchanges between the two countries. Undoubtedly the expansion of commercial and cultural exchanges through this river could lead to the consolidation of peace and goodneighborly relations between the two and remove the doubts in their relations. Nothing is impossible. Under goodneighborly conditions, Tehran might grant concessions to Iraq to use Iranian ports; and in return for these concessions, Iraq could recognize the Algiers agreement.

We want to hope that the good intentions and the sense of responsibility of the Iranian and Iraqi leaders will overcome [word indistinct] deductions and that they will not be diverted from the path which leads toward understanding.

Moscow Views 'Confrontation' of Ideas in Iran

NC0706152790 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] The week commemorating Ayatollah Khomeyni is ending in Iran. The Iranian leadership held a ceremony on the anniversary of the death of the political-religious leader of the antimonarchical revolution and the founder of the Islamic Republic. Our commentator writes:

The week to commemorate Ayatollah Khomeyni is being held at a time when the confrontation between the supporters and opponents of reconstruction in the country is intensifying. Naturally the two sides in the confrontation are assessing the late Imam's legacy differently and want to use his unabated personality for varying objectives.

The fundamentalists use Imam Khomeyni to intensify the atmosphere of fanaticism and intolerance. Under this label they confer a holy aspect on their claims for unimpeded power, on their effort to run the country by suppression and repression, and on their wish to preserve the privileges enjoyed by a small but rich strata of clergymen. They use Khomeyni's name as the banner of the policy of exporting the Islamic revolution by resorting to force—a policy which the Islamic fundamentalists still support.

All of this was apparent in their speeches at the tomb of the late Imam in Behesht-e Zahra. In these speeches Khomeyni was almost portrayed not only as the determiner of the fate of not only the Islamic world but of the entire world.

I do not think that fanaticism and extremism govern the thoughts and hearts of all the Iranians. The wave of religious zeal which was lit in the week commemorating Khomeyni of course may alienate some of the people from reality, but not for long. Today the idea of reconstruction and the inclination and interest toward democratization is supported by a large circle of Iranian society.

[Word indistinct] as in the past is impossible. Almost on the eve of the week to commemorate Ayatollah Khomeyni, nearly 90 outstanding representatives of Iran's freedom and democratic movement sent a statement to Iranian President Hashemi-Rafsanjani in which the country's antidemocratic system was criticized and which called for reforms in society. Despite various obstacles, the [word indistinct] are striving for democratic reforms, and this struggle is manifested in the protest against the Islamic garb—this symbol of medieval oppression and suppression of women. That part of the clergymen too who are more far-sighted and realistic—and whose example can be found in the face of the (?popular) Ayatollah Montazeri—are also calling for the liberalization of Iran's domestic life.

It seems that it is not without cause that the supporters of reconstruction among the Iranian leadership sort out from Khomeyni's legacy those parts which are more realistic and democratic in nature. They point out that Khomeyni was the leader of a revolution which propagated democratic ideas and the idea of liberating the country from poverty and foreign domination.

Some of these ideas have materialized. But generally speaking, 10 years after the victory of the revolution, the country has practically distanced itself from these ideas. Since the time when a new leadership came to power in Iran, an opportunity to return to a method which will help these ideas to materialize has been created. The important thing is not to lose this historic opportunity.

Foreign Ministry Meets With Arab League Envoy

Envoy Receives Soviet Official

LD0606162890 Kuwait KUNA in English 1539 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 6 (KUNA)—The Arab League ambassador to the Soviet Union al-Munsif al-May met here Wednesday with director of the Middle East and North Africa department at the Soviet Foreign Ministry Vladimir Polyakov, where he briefed him on the recent extraordinary Arab summit resolutions.

Speaking to a press conference, al-May said besides the emergency Arab summit resolutions, the meeting also tackled the Israeli criminal practices in the occupied Arab territories and the emigration of the Soviet Jews to the occupied Arab land and the immigration effects on the future of the Arab Palestinian people.

He also said that the meeting also tackled the Israeli efforts to harm the Soviet-Arab relations through settling the Soviet Jews emigrants in West Bank and Gaza Strip.

He stressed during his meeting with the Soviet official the Arab League's appreciation for the candid and clear stance of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev during his recent visit to the U.S. on the settling of Soviet Jews in the occupied Arab territories, particularly his indication to reconsider the immigration if Israel continued its settling policy.

Al-May asserted the necessity to continue efforts for holding an international peace conference on the Middle East to confront the Israeli settling plans.

Envoy Pleased With Stance

LD0806044690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1220 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Report by TASS Correspondent Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow, June 7 (TASS)—The Arab League Secretariat expresses its satisfaction in connection with the clear and distinct position of the USSR on the question of emigration of Soviet Jews and their resettlement by the Israeli authorities in the occupied Arab territories, which was outlined by Mikhail Gorbachev, the USSR president, during his visit to the United States. This was stated on Wednesday by al-Munsif al-May, head of the Arab League Representative Office in the USSR, at a meeting with Vladimir Polyakov, head of the Administration for the Near Eastern and North African Countries of the USSR Foreign Affairs Ministry.

In the course of the meeting, al-Munsif al-May familiarized Vladimir Polyakov with the decisions of the extraordinary committee of the heads of states and governments of the Arab countries in Baghdad. He also

discussed with him the escalation of the criminal repressions perpetrated by Israel in the occupied Arab territories and international responsibility in this connection.

Special satisfaction was expressed in connection with what Mikhail Gorbachev said about possible reconsideration by the Soviet Government of its approach to the question of emigration and about the possibility of its coordinating the continuation of emigration with the provision for the emigrees of complete freedom of choice.

Al-Munsif al-May asked Vladimir Polyakov to inform the Soviet leadership that the Arab League places high value upon its efforts to convene an international world conference and also to prevent Israel form using the Jewish emigration to underpin its own policy of creating settlements in the occupied Arab territories.

Egyptian Reportage on USSR Trade Argreement

WA1206160290

For Egyptian reportage on the signing in Cairo of a medium-term trade agreement for 1991-1995 between Egypt and the USSR, see the Egypt section of the 12 June issue of the Near East & South Asia DAILY REPORT.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Spokesman Comments on 'Radical' RSA Reforms

LD0906183290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0720 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 9 Jun (TASS)—Judging by reports from South Africa, Frederik de Klerk, RSA president, continues to implement his program of radical reforms aimed at dismantling the system of apartheid, a spokesman of the USSR Foreign Ministry said.

A few days ago the government submitted a draft law on abolishing racial segregation in public places for consideration by parliament, and also announced its intention in the near future to rescind one of the main apartheid laws that secured unjust division of the territory of the country between white and black citizens.

Yesterday President de Klerk announced the abolition of the four-year old state of emergency throughout the RSA, except for Natal Province, where bloody clashes have been going on for several years.

Similar measures, being adopted against the background of the negotiation process between Pretoria and the ANC [African National Congress], which has made a good start, lay the basis for creating an atmosphere of mutual trust, without which it is impossible to solve complex social and political problems that have accumulated in the past decades. [passage indistinct]

RSA Reforms Seen As 'Complicated' Situation

MB2505103890 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 24 May 90

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Recent developments in South Africa and the reaction to them in the black and white communities bring to the fore one definite realization: The reforms have clarified the political situation in the country, and on the other hand, they look more complicated.

The more promising the prospects of a dialogue between South Africa's most influential political forces, the Frederik de Klerk government and the ANC [African National Congress], the greater the resistance to change from the radicals.

This concerns, in the first place, the great extremist quarters in the white community. It's seriousness prompted Mr. de Klerk to state straightaway recently in Switzerland that, if he returned home empty-handed, the lack of recognition would play into the hands of the radicals, who do not want to see a peaceful solution in South Africa, and the radicals will gain political leverage.

On the one hand, that premise prompts the government to take decisive measures. On Tuesday [22 May], the law and order minister, Adriaan Vlok, told the Parliament that the government might use the full force of law against the armed right wing extremists, including gun control laws or emergency powers. Such a step is drastic, he said, but I am not prepared to allow these reckless and frightened people to push the country over the brink of a bloody racial conflict.

On the other hand, the government cannot help taking into account the mood of the white voters who are really frightened; hence, the ambiguous stance of the president against the black (?right wingers) and even the ANC, who proclaim that President de Klerk's reforms have nothing significant about them.

Nelson Mandela said in Johannesburg: It is not the reforms that he is making that interests us.

The ANC has got basic demands, the most basic of which is the demand for everybody to have the right to determine his own future. This is by far the most weighty problem on the road to a democratic South Africa. Hardly anyone can now question the readiness of the government and the ANC to want a dialogue and the ability to find a common [word indistinct] historic talks were held at the beginning of May.

A joint working group, set up in the course of the talks, has submitted its conclusions on one of the stumbling blocks in the run- up to full-fledged talks on the country's future, which is the issue of political prisoners.

On the whole, an agreement seems possible. Many analysts also feel optimistic at the prospects of breaking through other impasses. But, apart from this friction,

naturally arising between the two parties, both are affected by extremes in either left or right wing, black or white.

The crux of the matter lies in the different interpretations both sides put into the notion of realism.

South African Changes Seen 'Positively'

PM1106120190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS correspondent report: "USSR Foreign Ministry Spokesman's Reply"]

[Text] Answering a TASS diplomatic correspondent's question, a USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stated that, judging by reports from South Africa, RSA President Frederik de Klerk is continuing to implement the program of radical reforms he announced, aimed at dismantling the apartheid system.

A few days ago, the government submitted for parliament's consideration a draft law on repealing racial segregation in public places and also declared its intention to abolish in the immediate future one of the basic laws of apartheid, which enforces the unjust division of the country's territory between black and white inhabitants.

Such measures, being taken against a background of the negotiating process between Pretoria and the African National Congress of South Africa—which has started well—lay the basis for forming the atmosphere of mutual trust without which it is impossible to resolve the complex sociopolitical problems that have accumulated over the past decades.

Giving a positive assessment of these steps, Moscow expresses hopes of more active cooperation among all the country's political forces with the aim of maintaining the pace of changes, and of the formation of the conditions needed for beginning concrete talks on the question of South Africa's future.

South Africa, ANC Negotiations Viewed

90UF0151A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 8 May 90 p 3

[Andrey Balebanov opinion: "Dialogue of Partners"]

[Text] Preliminary negotiations have been held in Cape Town between delegations of South Africa's African National Congress (ANC) and the South African Government. The black majority of the Republic of South Africa did everything possible to ensure that the whites—for the first time in many decades—sat down together with its representatives at a "roundtable" to discuss a draft democratic constitution. The joint statement adopted upon the conclusion of the meeting expressed the aspiration of the parties to the dialogue to end the prevailing atmosphere of violence in the country and to ensure the stable and peaceful progress of further negotiations.

It would have been naive to have supposed that the first meeting between the ANC and the South African Government might have led immediately to a common denominator of the sides' positions. Nonetheless, it is perfectly appropriate to speak about certain results of the dialogue. Specifically, the delegations agreed to set up a working group, whose mission would include the elaboration before 21 May of a procedure for the release from legal liability of persons already convicted inside the country or outside it on political grounds. The government undertook to embark at once on a reexamination of all cases connected with membership of previously banned organizations and illegal departure from South Africa. In addition, the country's leadership is to urgently decide the question of granting persons accused of "political crimes" temporary immunity from prosecution.

The intention of the South African Government to review current legislation in the field of security for the purpose of creating conditions for normal political activity in the country should also be considered no less important a result of the dialogue. The authorities and the ANC agreed to remain in constant contact to effectively prevent any acts of terror and intimidation.

The negotiations were extremely important if only because they have given thousands of Africans tired of the violence of apartheid hope of achieving equality and a full-fledged human life. However, this simple truth was not to the liking of right wing forces of South Africa, who throughout the authorities' meeting with the ANC kept up a campaign of slander against the parties to the dialogue. In turn, extremist elements of the black community also attempted to hamper the negotiations, inciting chaos and unrest in the country.

Nonetheless, the dialogue took place. A dialogue of partners, what is more. The document adopted at the negotiations laid a good foundation for a normalization of the political situation in the country and on the continent as a whole. I would like to believe that the day when the hopes of the indigenous majority of South Africa for the elimination of apartheid are finally realized is not far off.

Ethiopian War, U.S. Joint Communique Examined

EA1006183290 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 9 Jun 90

[From the "East Africa Last Week" program]

[Text] The Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front [EPRDF] said in a broadcast on Thursday that the the rebels had won a number of victories. If that is true, the front is now only 10 km from Dese administrative area. Dese is a strategic town on the Addis Ababa-Aseb road. The EPRDF claimed it had killed

about 2,000 government soldiers. As usual, it did not mention its own losses. According to many observers, such reports have repeatedly been issued to counter Addis Ababa propaganda. The Ethiopian Government for its part said last week that its armed forces had won successive victories. In order to (?justify) this, the State Council said it had awarded bravery medals to four divisions of the Second Revolutionary Army.

According to the ASSOCIATED PRESS, the commanders of both the Ethiopian Government Armed Forces and of the opposition groups periodically claim to be winning victories, killing numbers of soldiers, and then repeat such reports. It is hard to judge the truth of such reports, because reporters have been banned from entering the areas where the fighting takes place. But the main thing is not who killed how many or who won. War is not like the soccer games that started in italy this week. Just hearing the claims by whichever side that it has killed, wounded, or captured numbers of human beings is horrible enough. How many thousands of lives of young Ethiopians have been devasted by the fighting? How many mothers, wives, and children have grieved? How many mothers, wives, and children have been left without children, husbands, and fathers? Count the empty houses.

War has brought suffering to the land of Ethiopia. Even (?humanitarian) organizations have been unable to provide humanitarian aid in time to save people from death. The Ethiopian people's suffering has filled many hearts with sorrow and wounded minds also.

That is why the leaders of the USSR and the United States, the two superpowers which used to be (?enemies), each working in pursuit of its own interests, have now been forced to issue a joint communique on Ethiopian affairs. The international community has voiced support for the Ethiopian Government statement agreeing to UN participation in finding a peaceful solution to the conflict in Eritrea and supplying relief aid to famine victims through the port of Mitsiwa, which is in the hands of the Eritrean People's Liberation Front. That is something to be thankful for, provided it is sincere and is implemented. Although more is expected, it is also a step forward. The main (?point) is that the United States and the USSR have said they will join hands to find a solution, and this is a good sign in itself.

Namibia's SWAPO, CPSU Sign Agreement

PM1206115390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A delegation from Namibia's South-West African People's Organization [SWAPO] headed by F. Nakholo [name as transliterated], secretary of the party central committee, was in Moscow 5-10 June at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

Talks were held with V.M. Falin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department. The delegation expressed its cordial gratitude to the Soviet people for the help and support given to Namibian patriots in the liberation struggle. The sides advocated the development of friendly relations between the USSR and independent Namibia. A protocol on cooperation between the CPSU and SWAPO for 1990-1992 was signed.

Somalia Opposition Rejects Samantar's Peace Plan

EA1006184090 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 9 Jun 90

[From the "East Africa Last Week" program]

[Text] Compared with Ethiopia, the Somali situation is not so critical. Reports from Mogadishu indicate that instead of war, efforts to engage in political talks with opposition parties are continuing. During discussions with the representative of a British company, Prime Minister Mohamed Ali Samantar said his country wants its problems solved peacefully. He appealed to all nations to prevail on the opposition leaders to come to the negotiating table.

So far, no opposition party has responded positively to the Mogadishu government's official peace call. All have indicated that they will take part in a constitutional conference or political discussions only if President Siad Barre resigns. Observers believe this suits Barre's supporters, because by adopting such a stance, the opposition parties are delaying the referendum.

In Samantar's view, all Somalis will be able to freely participate in political parties and activities only after the laws being debated in Parliament are passed. This means that when the constitutional amendment is passed, opposition parties will be able to take part in elections and become members of the new government that will be set up as a result of the amendment.

Portugal Speeds Up Angolan Peace Process

LD0606221390 Moscow in Portuguese to Portugal 2000 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Yuriy Konstantinov commentary]

[Text] Portugal is taking active diplomatic steps to speed up the Angolan peace process. As Durao Barrosa [Portuguese secretary of state for foreign affairs and cooperation] said after his return from Luanda, the Portuguese Government will give the maximum help to (?successive) direct talks between representatives of the people's Republic of Angola [PRA] and the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA] group for a constructive solution to the conflict which has raged for many years.

It is obvious—and this is stressed in Lisbon—that the success of direct talks can only be ensured by the goodwill of the parties involved, their desire to put an

end to the armed conflict which is to nobody's advantage and only brings doom and suffering to the people. The new points in the PRA's peace proposal could, in our view, serve as a good basis for talks, a way out of the impasse. There is no doubt that the government of Portugal, too, can contribute toward this. This is confirmed by Secretary of State Durao Barroso's mission to Luanda. Regrettably we must note that for the time being, Savimbi's group is far from constructive talks. How can negotiations be held with representatives of the Angolan Government while at the same time military operations are not only continuing but intensifying in norther Angola, armed sorties are being carried out in the provinces of Cabinda and Zaire, and Luanda deprived of electricity? The PRA's opinion is clear. It is necessary to end armed operations and to take the first step toward peace.

East Europe

Deputy Foreign Minister Meets Polish Ambassador

LD1206173490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1116 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 12 Jun (TASS)—Today Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, received Stanislaw Ciosek, ambassador of Poland to the USSR.

The conversation concerned the meeting in Brest between the USSR and FRG ministers of foreign affairs, and in particular the talks on the external aspects of a German settlement within the framework of the two-plus-four mechanism, as well as some issues of Soviet-Polish cooperation.

Bulgaria's Zhelev Cited on Elections

PM1106113590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Kapralov dispatch: "Let Democracy Triumph! Bulgarian Election Campaign Ends"]

[Text] Sofia—Tens of thousands of people from throughout the country arrived in Sofia by automobile, bus, and special train 7 June for the last Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] and Union of Democratic Forces [UDF] rallies before the elections. Roughly 1 million people in all took part in these demonstrations.

The participants in the two rallies were separated from one another by a buffer zone one-kilometer wide. There is no such dividing line in daily life. That is why on the eve of 7 June President Petur Mladenov urged all political forces to rise above emotions and not to lose their self-restraint. "The last days before the elections," he stressed, "are the most difficult period."

The square named for 9 September was full of flags bearing the red rose—the BSP emblem. This was the first time that the hammer and sickle had failed to feature on the red party banners. "Victory!" "Unity!" "Bulgaria"—these slogans were repeated many times over the heads of the rally's participants, most of whom were past the first flush of youth.

Aleksandr Lilov, chairman of the BSP Higher Party Council, stressed in his speech that the number of the party's members has topped 1 million for the first time in its 100-year history. A vigorous influx of young people began when the Zhivkov regime came to an end. The speaker pointed out that the decisive steps to renew and transform the BSP into a modern left-type party were the main reason for this.

Stressing that it was the party that opened the way to democracy 10 December 1989, Lilov expressed socialists' determination to effect a peaceful transition to a humane, democratic society, along with the conviction that the coming elections will confirm the BSP's role as the country's most influential political force. He confirmed the BSP position regarding the need to form a broad-based coalition government regardless of the election results.

The UDF is perhaps the most impressive phenomenon in Bulgaria's political life since 10 November. The BSP sees the union not only as its election rival but also as its inevitable partner in the coming hard work of drafting a constitution, reforming the legal system, and escaping from the economic crisis.

The UDF is a bloc of 16 parties and movements. It is supported by hundreds of thousands of Bulgarians. "Why hundreds of thousands? Millions," Zhelyu Zhelev, the UDF leader, corrected me during a recent conversation at the union's headquarters on Rakovski Street.

The UDF was spawned by hatred for totalitarianism and a thirst for change. If Bulgaria has covered the path of democratic transformations in just seven months—which would have taken several years under a one-party system—it is owing to the fact that the opposition was constantly breathing down the ruling party's neck. The presence of a powerful opponent has facilitated the rapid renewal of the BSP itself.

The most varied strata—from intellectual elite to lumpen proletariat—follow the UDF. The newspaper DUMA has written that the bulk of the UDF's supporters are ordinary working people who have grown mentally weary of the 45-year domination of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP]. "For 45 years they have heard continually that the BCP is the organizer and inspirer of all their victories. They have heard enough, and now they want change." In the newspaper's opinion, they do not, however, have any prejudice against the BSP and they may support it again tomorrow if they receive proof that the party has totally rid itself of the burden of totalitarianism.

"UDF members," Zhelyu Zhelev said, "are united by a democratic platform that can be reduced to two basic ideas—the first being the transition from a totalitarian system to a Western-type democratic, pluralist society,

and the second being that the transition must be effected by peaceful, nonviolent means, without repressions, terror, and the settling of scores."

Our 45-year experience and the 70-year Soviet experience show that socialism and democracy are incompatible. There is not and cannot be democratic socialism if by this we are to understand a society founded on the state form of ownership, the UDF leader asserted categorically.

The fundamental difference between our platform, Zhelev continued, and the BSP platform resides in the fact that we advocate the complete democratization of the country by destroying all the totalitarian structures inherent in the present regime—both in the economy and in political life. We suggest things that are really feasible, things that many countries have already done. All you have to do is look at our neighbor, Greece, to see what they have done in their country and what has been done in ours. At the same time the BSP is proposing a new version of the old sociopolitical utopia—democratic socialism. It has already been real socialism, mature socialism, and developed socialism—and now democratic socialism is what is intended. But no one can explain the nature of democratic socialism...

I asked Zhelev how he assesses the public opinion polls which forecast a BSP election victory, and about the UDF's attitude toward participation in a coalition government.

"First, we consider these polls untrustworthy since they are part of the election campaign and the machinations by which the BSP is influencing public opinion. We have other figures which show a decisive majority for the UDF. As for participation in a possible coalition government: If the BSP is victorious, we have no intention of participating in it. However, this viewpoint must not be considered final, since political decisions must be adopted on the basis of the specific election results and in the light of the situation. As for cooperation with individual party members (in the event of a UDF victory—A.K.), there are good specialists, experts, and competent people among them who will seek to cooperate with us. We even believe that some BSP members will vote for the UDF.

At the UDF rally 7 June Zhelev once again said forcibly: If we leave the communists in power, it will be a catastrophe. Europe and the entire world will see this as meaning that we are not yet old enough for democracy."

However, democracy above all represents freedom of choice. All the conditions have been created for honest elections, for the first really free elections in Bulgaria. Journalists and hundreds of foreign guests will be given access to all polling stations. In my view forgery and falsification would be fatal for any political force.

"Victory at the 10 June elections will be ours!" Lilov said at the BSP rally. "We will win!" was heard at the UDF rally. The following BTA report came in after midnight: "There have been no incidents."

That is a good sign—a sign that democracy will triumph, that Bulgaria will triumph at the elections.

Bulgarian Elections, Parties Described

WA0706185490 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Article by PRAVDA special correspondents L. Zhmyrev and A. Krushinskiy: "Time to Make Decisions"]

[Text] Sofia, Moscow—"What is really happening around us? Are the workers and peasants of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, the GDR, and Romania really destroying with their own hands what they have created—socialism? Meanwhile, our press and TV maintain that 'profound political transformations' are under way there... I would like to get a substantiated public response."

These lines from a letter by Ya.I. Zyabkin, a resident of the city of Pugachev, are typical of PRAVDA's current mail. The newspapers are publishing a great deal of various information on the East European countries. However, the processes under way there are so multifaceted, unusual, and changeable that any publication on a specific topic is like "a hole in the fence" which makes it possible to discern specific facts without understanding their mutual connection. This is why PRAVDA will respond to these letters with letters of its own: Correspondents will discuss the situation in the East European countries using freedom of plots and sincerity in relaying impressions which are characteristic of this genre.

What is on the mind of Bulgaria at present? We are ready to bet: If someone asks about this on the streets of Sofia the same answer will be given: "Elections, of course!"

Economic reform, political discussions, and store shelves—everything is evaluated at present from the angle of forthcoming elections to the Great National Assembly, which is to work out a new constitution of the country. Here is a sample of statements about elections made from, so to speak, foreign policy positions: "I am afraid for the Bulgarian people—they may become the laughing stock of all of Europe if, God forbid, they vote in favor of the communists." This is what a Petr Beron, secretary of the opposition Union of Democratic Forces (SDS) stated at a press conference. To be sure, this statement grates on one's ears, but we quoted it because Bulgarian peculiarities show through in it. As is known, elections have already been held in the GDR, Hungary, and Poland, and the left parties were defeated in all three of the countries (according to predictions, this also threatens the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia). Meanwhile, here in the People's Republic of Bulgaria even a zealous opponent of the Bulgarian Socialist Party,

the successor of the Bulgarian Communist Party, acknowledges that there is a realistic possibility of it winning, as we can see!

What has provided this opportunity? As we see it, the fact that the process of renewal in Bulgaria began on the initiative of the party is an important reason. Unlike in a number of other East European countries, here the elimination of compromised leaders and the renunciation of the constitutional monopoly of the communists on power did not occur due to mass disturbances or under pressure from "the street," but by the will of progressively-minded party functionaries. For example, in Prague an extraordinary congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia resolved to expel the old leadership from the party almost to a man, whereas in Sofia, at the extraordinary 14th Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP], some of the old leaders, the initiators of renewal, took seats on the working presidium with dignity, and ended up elected to leading positions.

Let us immediately qualify this: There is "an Achilles heel" to all of this, because "allergy" with regard to politicians who were involved in any way whatever with the previous nomenklatura of Zhivkov is getting stronger in Bulgaria. We recall how Lila G., our good friend and a veteran of anti-Fascist struggle and labor, threatened in the days of the 14th congress: "Despite having been a BCP member for many years I am going to vote against Communist Party candidates in the elections—I do not trust its leaders." However, here is an opposite view: "If it were not for Dzhurov, Mladenov, Lukanov, and Lilov, we would still be singing the praises of Zhivkov. These people have shown courage, and at the same time they have authority, experience, and flexibility."

In old Bulgaria the opinion was that policy is made in Sofia, but the provinces decide the outcome of elections. We decided to familiarize ourselves with the peculiarities of Bulgarian perestroyka using as an example the small city of Samokovo, which is one hour away from the capital by car. The city is known for the sensational win of the socialist "tesnyaks" [the "strict" faction] in local elections here in 1910. "The Samokovo Commune" was the first city of socialists in the Balkans: For 18 months a red flag flew over the city hall. We thought that if Marxists could win even under the circumstances of that time, at present, as they say, it might be God's own will.

Here is one more reason which prompted us to travel there: The party organization of the Samokovo obstina is headed by our good friend Nikola Nikolov, not so long ago a secretary of the BCP Sofia Oblast Committee. He traded in a spacious office in Sofia for a modest room in a quiet town, and instead of several dozen thousand party members "reporting" to him he now has slightly over 4,300.

However, we could not detect even a hint of nostalgia for the old times in what he said. He discussed perestroyka without regret and, as it seemed to us, even with enthusiasm. Meanwhile, quite recently even a thought about something of this nature would have been perceived as heresy: Primary organizations at the place of employment have been disbanded, and instead of them "main," as they are referred to here, party organizations are being created at the place of residence.

We had our doubts: "What can a physician or a teacher have in common with old people and retirees? Is it not a pity to lose touch with one's colleagues who are of the same mind?"

"On top of this, we also have professional clubs. As far as teachers are concerned, they have created their own professional party club. Physicians prefer to be registered at territorial organizations for now: They believe for a good reason that people of their profession can do more good in block organizations."

Our conversation turned to the elections.

Nikolov said: "We strive to build our relationship with the opposition as our future partners. Aggressive behavior on its part does occur, and at times it affects the people: After all, many people now want an immediate resolution of many complex issues and a better life. But life is, alas, getting worse..."

Here it is, the core of present-day problems! In the environment of political pluralism, the party's retention of its membership is merely the first step. After all, if only BSP [Bulgarian Socialist Party] members vote for its candidates, this will ensure merely 10 to 15 percent of votes. No matter how large the party is, it is merely a segment of the people. The fate of parliamentary seats will be decided by nonparty members, and authority should be gained among them.

It appears that the BSP has quite a few assets. These are the elimination of the regime of personal power of T. Zhivkov, and initiative in rectifying grave errors regarding the nationalities issue and in promoting democratization. However, there is a liability capable of offsetting everything positive: the grave situation in the economy. Recently the Sofia satirical weekly STURSHEL carried a biting cartoon. One mouse is telling another: "They no longer place mousetraps, but cheese is no longer available either." The BSP has assumed the burden of responsibility for all of these complex problems.

...We recall that after the completion of the 14th Extraordinary BCP Congress both of us were in an elevated mood: After all, the proceedings were interesting, and they brought a fresh current to the life of the party and the country. However, our hearts were filled with alarm when a message came on the refusal of the opposition to join a coalition government! Another surprise followed immediately: The BZNS [Bulgarian National Agrarian Union] which had traditionally taken part in the government also gave up its ministerial posts. Now, after the

introduction of a genuine multiparty system, the government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria has become... a one-party government for the first time in 40 years!

Let us quote Stefan Prodev, editor in chief of the newspaper DUMA (at the time it was still called RABOTNICHESKO DELO) in order to appreciate how dramatic the situation was. He wrote in his comments: "Refusing reciprocity, refusing to collectively stand in the way of trouble and take the hand which is held out is something more than just a political play. This is antipolitics."

A friend of ours put it this way: "This is a trick cyclists use: One of the contestants closely trails another, in order to overtake him just before the finish line. The opposition hopes that by the 'finish' (elections, that is) life will unavoidably deteriorate, the people will blame the government and, accordingly, us, the communists."

Indeed, the new leadership of the party undergoing perestroyka assumed a heavy burden. Let us recall that the foreign debt of Bulgaria is dangerously high: approximately $11 billion, or more than $1,200 per capita (meanwhile, the country's annual hard currency exports are under $2 billion). Strikes flare up every now and then: Labor collectives and entire industries demand wage increases and better conditions on the job. But where is the money to come from if in the first quarter of 1990 production fell by almost 10 percent compared to the same period of 1989? According to an estimate by trade union leaders, more than one-half of the population lives below the poverty line. Meanwhile, inflation is mounting. Sugar, butter, cheese, and baby food keep disappearing from the stores. Long lines of cars begin to form in front of the gas stations. Head of government Andrey Lukanov said at a session of the People's Republic of Bulgaria National Assembly: "Our economic crisis is the crisis of an economic model built on a utopian foundation. This is not only the crisis of the Bulgarian economy, this is the crisis of an economic system created within the framework of the Stalinist model of socialism." He noted that a transition to a market economy is necessary, but initial negative social consequences cannot be avoided in the process.

In short, it is going to get even worse... "The worse things are the better it is"—the secret adherence of many opposition leaders to this motto is confirmed, if by nothing else, by their repeatedly rejecting the appeals of the BSP and the president of the country to place national interests above party interests and introduce a moratorium on mutual insults. Quite the contrary, the opposition increasingly often organizes rallies with the participation of many thousands and does not miss any opportunity to aggravate the situation.

What is the Bulgarian opposition about, after all? We think that until recently most readers of PRAVDA had no idea whatsoever that it exists, and they were likewise absolutely unaware of the presence of any anti-Soviet attitudes in this country, where they liked to address the Russians with the affectionately diminutive word "bratushka," and where a joke used to circulate to the effect that there is only one point of disagreement between our two peoples: "Who loves whom more?" Most people are somehow unaware of the fact that influential Russophobic circles have existed in this country for a long time along with the Russophile current (imagine that in 1886, that is, a mere eight years after fighting jointly for the liberation of the country, Russia and Bulgaria... severed diplomatic relations).

After 1945, there were and are those in Bulgaria who are not happy with the political system which, incidentally, is natural. However, the ecological movement was, perhaps, the most powerful current which "fed" the present-day opposition. The so-called "Ruse Defense Committee" protested against enterprises from the Romanian side polluting the air in this city on the Danube. Zhivkov interpreted this as interference in his friendly relations with Ceausescu, and repressions were used against members of the committee (prominent representatives of the intelligentsia, among whom there was also the wife of Stanko Todorov, a member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo). However, the "greens" did not knuckle under and continued to organize their demonstrations fearing no clashes with law enforcement forces....

Late last year the Union of Democratic Forces was formed here under the "umbrella" in which about 20 parties and movements interact. Along with the BSP and the BZNS, it constitutes one of the main political forces in the preelection struggle.

It should be mentioned that the new leadership of the party of communists came out immediately and resolutely in favor of legalizing the opposition and a dialogue with it on an equal footing. In December and January the leaders of the BCP and the SDS acted in concert in the cause of restoring the rights of the Turkish-speaking populace, which the Zhivkov group trampled on, standing up to the powerful pressure of the dissatisfied local party apparatus. Alas, the "antipolitics" of the SDS in response to the offer to form a coalition government became something of a declaration of war, a cruel war which abounds in processions under the banner "Death to the Communists!", the destruction of stands with BSP posters, and even the beating of its supporters. Representatives of the BSP promise to create a coalition government if they win the elections, whereas the SDS headquarters has just one thing to say: "In the event that we win, we will not even think about cooperating with the communists."

The opposition operates in the old manner, in the spirit of the mentality of intolerance which has, apparently, become its second nature, at a time when the BSP and representatives of the left-wing forces are substantively reforming their thinking and striving for mutual understanding and dialogue.

Such is the political situation in which BSP representatives in the government and other organs of power have worked out and begun to implement an anticrisis program, trying not to neglect long-term goals as well—a radical reform of the national economy. Of course, heightened caution has to be displayed with regard to the reform at a time when every step by the government is taken under the super- vigilant observation of the opposition, and any miscalculation may be exaggerated and exploited in the preelection struggle. We think that here they would not bring themselves to taking such a step as a sharp increase in retail prices for main foodstuffs.

May was the first month this year in which an increase in production emerged. Experts of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development who visited Bulgaria found that "the economic reform is proceeding in the right direction." Here is the opinion of the London newspaper THE GUARDIAN: The BSP has won a moral victory over the opposition precisely due to its assuming the burden of responsibility for governing the country despite the SDS boycott.

Public opinion surveys confirm this indirectly. Thus in March 39 percent of those polled said that they would have voted for the communists, in April—40.7 percent, and in May—44.4 percent. The rating of the SDS is more modest: According to the same survey, in March 15 percent of the voters would have voted for it, in April—29.7 percent, and in May—25.7 percent. The BZNS and small opposition parties which have not joined the SDS have even fewer supporters. However, approximately one-third of the voters have not made up their minds yet, and their votes may be decisive...

Despite the assertion of one of the SDS leaders quoted above, Europe has no inclination at all "to laugh" at the adherence of a considerable segment of Bulgarians to the values of socialism. It is rather the excessive belligerence of the opposition that is greeted with irony. At present the business people of the West are interested in the political and economic stability of the region more than they are in defaming the Reds. We think that in this sense the policy of the BSP is more to their liking than that of the SDS.

In summation, let us describe a curious fact. The newspaper DUMA announced a competition of sorts for its readers: "My preelection slogan." A Dobrin Spasov set forth on the pages of the newspaper what appears to be a paradoxical appeal at first sight: "Members of the opposition, vote for the BSP!" This is how he explains this: "I am convinced that a BSP victory in the elections promises the opposition an historic opportunity because the BSP is in favor of a national unity government. On the contrary, the success of the opposition in the elections would entail the most dangerous consequences for the opposition because it is aiming at dividing our society for a long time."

German Unity Terms 'Dictated by FRG'

PM1206111390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[Interview with Andre Brie, member of the GDR Party of Democratic Socialism Board Presidium, by own correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov under the rubric "East Europe: Who Is in Power?": "Germans Still Concerned"; date not specified]

[Excerpts] "It is hard to answer the question of power in the GDR," Andre Brie, member of the Party of Democratic Socialism [PDS] Board Presidium, reckons. "Every GDR minister is accompanied by advisers from the FRG."

"The GDR is now effectively being wound up. The process of uniting the two German states has begun," Andre Brie said.

Andre Brie directed the PDS election activity during the two election campaigns—for the Volkskammer and for the local government bodies. [passage omitted]

[Podklyuchnikov] What are the people who have formed the government like?

[Brie] In my opinion, only Lothar de Maiziere and Social Democrat Walter Romberg, minister of finance, are sincerely concerned for the interests of the GDR population. By and large the government is aiming to unite the two German states as rapidly as possible. The preparation of the FRG-GDR state treaty on a currency, economic, and social union was the touchstone here. Its terms were largely dictated by the FRG.

[Podklyuchnikov] Are the members of the incumbent GDR Government competent in the affairs of the ministries that they head?

[Brie] Not very. Virtually none of them was engaged in active political and state activity in the past. They lack the requisite experience. Many opposed the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, were considered "dissidents," and were persecuted in various ways. The cabinet members include four theologians. But it must said that ministers do not need to be particularly competent under conditions when preparations for the unification of the GDR and the FRG are under way. Bonn was worried about them. A commission of economic experts headed by the West German Christian Democrat Elmar Pieroth has been set up under the prime minister. Each minister has advisers from the FRG.

[Podklyuchnikov] Could the GDR Government affect the substance of the treaty with the FRG?

[Brie] I mentioned the fact that the treaty has been dictated by Bonn. Its details were kept secret for a long time. Both our incumbent government and most Volkskammer deputies do not deem it necessary to change anything in it. It is remarkable that the social aspect of the treaty aroused anxiety not in the GDR's Social Democratic Party [SPD] but in the FRG's SPD. Our

SPD by and large holds more right-wing positions than social democracy in the FRG.

The conclusion of the planned union with the FRG means that the GDR renounces an important part of its sovereign rights. Everything relating to finance, economic and social questions is to be handed over to the FRG.

The pace at which Bonn is conducting the unification process cannot fail to arouse concern either. Let me say for comparison's sake that the process of incorporating the Saarland into the FRG—when France handed it over—took several years. Yet the Saarland is not comparable with the GDR.

The incumbent GDR government bears great responsibility. It must make efforts to ensure that the creation of a united Germany does not become a threat to the other peoples of Europe. The peoples' hopes for a united Germany to become part of a new European security system and serve stability on our continent must not be disappointed.

West Europe

Further on Shevardnadze, Genscher Meeting

LD1106214190 Moscow TASS in English 2122 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Report by TASS special correspondents Sergey Sosnovskiy, Georgiy Shmelev, and Ivan Kuksa]

[Text] Brest (Belorussia) June 12 TASS—Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze told a news conference that his working meeting with West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher here on Monday was very useful, productive and necessary.

Summing up the results of the meeting, Shevardnadze told the news conference he held jointly with the West German foreign minister he had invited Genscher to Brest, a border town burned into the history of Soviet-German relations, as a symbolic gesture.

"Brest reminds us of our common past on the one hand and manifests our will and intention to draw the final line under that past, under the results of World War II and open a new page in the history of relations between the two states," Shevardnadze said.

The minister stressed that meetings like this one were not for decision-making but for looking for options which could lead to mutually acceptable solutions.

According to Shevardnadze, while discussing external aspects of German unification, he and Genscher focused on the problem of Germany's military-political status. The minister noted that was the most important question and the sides were currently exploring the possibility to achieve an agreement on principles of mutual relations between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, which forms the first group of problems.

The second group of problems related to the reduction of the level of military confrontation in Europe at the talks of twenty-three in Vienna, Shevardnadze said.

The third group of problems concerns the dynamics of the European-scale process.

During the working meeting in Brest, Eduard Shevardnadze noted, the sides declared that their high-priority task was to set up European centres for the prevention of conflicts.

The talks re-confirmed the desire of the two sides to closely cooperate in the development of projects of the relevant security structures for Europe. The Soviet foreign minister said that it would take time to implement their understandings.

Hence the need to work out the regulations for the transition period and identify measures which should be taken during this period. In this respect the Brest meeting helped clear up numerous problems.

West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher agreed with the description of his meeting with Shevardnadze as useful and constructive. "Shevardnadze informed me of the meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee in Moscow and I told him about the session of the NATO Council in Scotland," Genscher said.

He said that the Western alliance highly appraised the results of the Political Consultative Committee's meeting in Moscow and in turn, at its meeting in Turnberry, extended the hand of friendship and cooperation to the Soviet Union, and other East European countries which testified to changes in relations between the two alliances.

The two ministers noted that much attention had been given during their meeting in Brest to the discussion of bilateral relations and their prospects.

Responding to journalists' questions, the ministers stressed the constructive nature of their talks and a trustful atmosphere in the spirit of mutual understanding and interaction.

Asked about the problem of the Polish-German border, the West German foreign minister noted that it would be solved with the united Germany and that "nobody intended to infringe on that border." He stressed the great constructive significance of the two-plus-four mechanism for the decision of the border issue.

The minister agreed to continue their discussion in Berlin on June 22.

Visits War Memorial

LD1106214690 Moscow TASS in English 2040 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Brest, Western Belorussia June 12 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

At the close of a brief working meeting and a joint news conference here on Monday, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his West German counterpart Hans-Dietrich Genscher visited the Brest fortress memorial complex which is sited within the city boundaries.

This citadel played a heroic role on the first days of the Great Patriotic War. Among hundreds of defenders of the fortress who gave their lives at the very outset of the Nazi invasion was senior Sergeant Akaki Shevardnadze, deputy commander of company of the 333 Rifle Regiment, elder brother of the now Soviet foreign minister.

He died valiantly in the land of Brest on the first day of the war. His name among 230 names of servicemen who died here is carved on the slab of the sacred acropolis.

Shevardnadze and Genscher laid wreaths at the eternal flame of the Brest fortress and honoured by a minute of silence the memory of the servicemen who perished here.

Later on Shevardnadze and persons accompanying him visited the Pamyat Ilicha collective farm in Brest district.

German Unity Viewed

LD1206143290 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Text] The official text of the speech by Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze at the news conference in Brest follows below. He said:

I would like to thank Mr. Genscher for his agreement to hold this meeting in Brest. The choice of Brest is of profound symbolic significance. On the one hand, of course, this is a reminder of several pages in our joint past.

On the other hand, it is a demonstration of the will and intent to draw a final line under the past war and to open a new chapter in our history, whose content will be a genuine good neighborliness deprived of all fear and apprehension and a full-scale, mutually advantageous cooperation.

I would like to explain, as it were, the mandate of these meetings. They are being held with the agreement of the other members of the "six" and we are informing our colleagues about their results.

The idea here is that our two countries should attempt to find mutual understanding and throw light on their approaches toward the resolution of various external aspects of the construction of German unity.

The reality is such that it is precisely our two sides that are dealing with the widest range of issues. Some of them touch primarily on bilateral relations.

I am holding what is already my third meeting in three weeks with my friend Mr. Genscher in such a format. I will say openly that very quickly we emerged from the stage of elucidating our intentions and started purely diplomatic work, the finding of formulas which could present an opportunity for resolving the problem at the subsequent sitting of the "six." It is pleasing that we are making progress from one meeting to the next. For the sake of fairness, it must be said that this is not only the contribution of the ministers; we meet after the sitting of groups headed by the directors of the appropriate political departments.

Many positions are first "given a run in" in this group of experts.

I would like to reiterate that we decide nothing at meetings between two people. We seek options that can provide a solution.

What external aspects of German unity do we contemplate above all?

First, the military and political status of Germany. It is the most difficult issue. Now we are studying the possibility of reaching an agreement on some kind of principles, elements, and foundations of relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

You know that there are no disagreements between us on the fact that both blocs should be transformed into mainly political alliances. This being the case, there is every reason for us to be able to contemplate the possibility of these alliances reaching a mutual understanding and concluding between them, say, some kind of agreement. This would give us all great freedom to find a compromise on the question of the military and political status of Grmany.

I would not say that here we are looking at everything identically, but both sides believe that such an approach holds much promise and will help in finding a novel approach to the problem that we have to resolve.

I do not wish to go into specifics just now. I ask that you take my word for it, that both Mr. Genscher and I see long-term opportunities here.

So, the first set of problems includes the transformation of the two alliances and future relations between them. As I said in Copenhagen, the conference of the leaders of the Warsaw Pact member states really did make a good start on this.

The second set includes the task of reducing levels of military confrontation in Europe at the talks of the 23 in Vienna. They are not at present discussing questions concerning the number of Armed Forces belonging to the sides, but it is obvious that in a future Europe much will depend on the levels of troops belonging to the states. It is important to have an idea now of what numbers of troops European states will have to know what may be at issue.

The third group of problems is the dynamics of the all-European process. We take as our starting point the intention stated at the meeting of the "six" in Bonn to present the meeting of the leaders of the 35 European

states with an agreement on resolving external aspects of German unity which we are counting on agreeing on by that time, at the "six."

Back in Bonn all the ministers stressed the link between German unity and the institutionalization of the all-European process.

Mr. Genscher and I discussed the most important steps in this direction. In essence we have the same view of the range of the institutions and structures that should be created within the framework of the CSCE process.

It is of special importance that we consider the establishment of all-European centers for preventing and settling conflicts to be a primary task.

This conversation between us confirmed once again that we will closely cooperate in formulating plans for the relevant security structures for Europe.

It is clear that we need not only to find formulas for resolving the various external aspects of German unity; we also need time to implement these accords in practice. For example, take the question of the presence of foreign troops on German soil. It should be limited by definite treaty-based periods. There are quite a few such questions. Hence the need to elaborate on the status of the transitional period and define the measures that must be implemented during this transitional period.

Setting limits and timescales for starting a formal settlement and finally concluding it is a complex matter.

The discussion we held has helped us clarify many issues.

In view of what we have achieved here in Brest, we will be able more effectively to continue work within the "six" in Berlin on 22 June. We agreed that our experts will work very hard during the period ahead. It is planned that contacts at the ministerial level will be frequent.

As usual we also had detailed discussions here on a range of issues of bilateral relations as well as on prospects for cooperation between our two countries in various areas.

In conclusion I would like to stress once again the idea that we must do everything to ensure that a future united Germany is a factor for peace and stability in Europe.

We consider this meeting to have been highly productive and necessary. It took place in a constructive atmosphere of goodwill.

Solton on German Unity

LD1106161190 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] Talks have opened in the Belorussian town of Brest on the Polish-Soviet border between the Soviet Foreign Minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, and his West German counterpart Hans-Dietrich Genscher. The search for a mutually acceptable solution to the issue of the political and military status of unified Germany continues. This is what Radio Moscow's Yuriy Solton writes.

The German problem, particularly its external aspect, is now the centerpiece of European politics. Much depends on its solution—the course of the European process, whose essence lies in transition from the former confrontation to mutual trust and cooperation, prospects for cuts in conventional armed forces, which in the long-run would lead to lowering the levels of military potentials to the limits of sensible defense sufficiency and the construction of a new system of European security to replace the present bloc structures. So far, no version that would be suitable to all has been found. The stand taken by Western leaders who favor the unlimited inclusion of a unified German state into NATO is unacceptable to the Soviet Union both in political and military and psychological terms. Just imagine the outcry that would be raised in Britain, France, and other West European countries if the unified Germany declared that it decided to join the Warsaw Treaty and not NATO.

Why then is the Soviet Union, which in the war with Nazi Germany lost 27 million lives, expected to make concessions in such a fundamental issue that concerns every Soviet citizen? True, the NATO leaders have said that it's necessary to alleviate Moscow's anxiety and give assurances. But mere assurances of good intention no matter how authoritative are insufficient. What is needed is practical guarantees that strategic stability on the continent will not be upset, that the postwar borders will not be violated, that security will be ensured not only for the Soviet Union but also for all European nations. The inclusion of a unified Germany into NATO in itself doesn't provide for such guarantees.

So is this a deadlock? It is so far, but in my view, continues Yuriy Solton, it can be broken if the two sides refrain from sticking to tough stands. This is the only way out. Moscow has given corresponding signals. It has called for searching persistently for versions that would be suitable to all. It does insist on accepting only its own proposal. President Gorbachev said during the recent visit to the Soviet Union by the British prime minister, Mrs. Thatcher, let it be the version of the British prime minister or somebody else's. It doesn't matter who proposes it, what matters is that it would be a version taking into account the present realities and reflecting a balance of interests, a version that would sow no suspicions but stimulate the positive processes emerging in Europe. Will such a version be worked out and accepted, asks in conclusion Yuriy Solton?

Genscher Concludes Visit

LD1106184190 Moscow TASS in English 1828 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Brest June 11 TASS—West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher left Brest for Bonn on

Monday night after his working meeting with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

Supreme Soviet Committee Arrives in Bonn

LD1206170590 Moscow TASS in English 1614 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Serov]

[Text] Bonn June 12 TASS—A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for the Affairs of Women, Protection of the Family, Motherhood and Childhood arrived in West Germany at the invitation of Bundestag chairman Rita Suessmuth.

Valentina Matvienko, the committee chairwoman, told TASS that the delegation wanted, in the first place, to see how West Germany tackles the problems of social security of women and how their equality is enforced.

"During the trip we will also be able to see the work of various medical and disease prevention establishments," she said.

Matvienko stressed the great importance of the visit to West Germany as part of efforts to promote interparliamentary ties and exchange experience between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the parliaments of other countries.

Baltic Fleet Detachment Ends Visit to FRG

LD0906140590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1125 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Lev Volnukhin]

[Text] Kiel, 8 Jun (TASS)—The three-day official visit to the FRG by a detachment of ships from the Baltic Fleet, namely the destroyer Bystriy and patrol escort Neukrotimiy, has come to an end. These days will be long remembered by the residents of Kiel, the administrative center of Schleswig-Holstein and a major port and naval base on the FRG's Baltic Coast.

Within the framework of the visit, many meetings were held between Soviet and West German sailors, as were joint sports contests and performances by amateur artistes. Rear-Admiral V.I. Litvinov, commander of the detachment, paid a visit to the Government of Schleswig-Holstein and to the Kiel town council.

Vice-Admiral D.F. Braun, commander of the Fleet of the FRG Navy, placed a high value on the visit. The Soviet ships' stay in Kiel, he said, is a sort of political signal which reflects the high standard of relations between the two countries. Particularly important is the fact that the many meetings, conversations, and human contacts have enabled us to know one another and understand one another better. Mutual trust is vital to us and this can only be attained by means of dialogue and the open exchange of views.

This morning the destroyer Bystriy and the patrol escort Niukrotimiy left the hospitable port and headed for their home shores.

Petrovskiy Summarizes Work of Copenhagen Forum

LD0806164690 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Yevgeniy Kiselev and Taras Lariokhin]

[Text] Copenhagen June 8 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy, who is now in Copenhagen to attend the second meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe devoted to the human dimension, held a news conference here today.

The Soviet delegation, he said, noted with satisfaction that the first stage of the Copenhagen meeting, ending today, got off to a good start and is dealing with matters relating to human rights in a business-like and serious manner.

Constructive efforts by governments are accompanied by the useful parallel activity of numerous non-governmental human rights organisations.

Our approach to the Copenhagen meeting was outlined in the speech by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze made on June 5. Copenhagen, we hope, must help set in motion the bank of ideas and proposals formed in Paris.

The first phase in the work of the present forum makes it possible to draw the conclusion that consensus is now taking shape with respect to the recognition that the establishment of a single legal space for all participants in the conference for security and cooperation in Europe is a high priority task at present. During the period of rapid changes in Europe, legal stability is becoming an integral part of the steady development of the Europe-scale process and universal observance of human rights.

As regards the Soviet delegation, we intend to actively promote the specifying of the concept of the legal space on the practical plane. We share the opinion of those who favors developing documents about the primacy of the law, the right of nations to elections and a system of confidence-building and verification measures in the humanitarian and legal sphere.

On the first day of the Copenhagen meeting, the Soviet delegation acted as the co-author of documents on the end to the propaganda of hatred and the supremacy of the law.

We also consider it very important under present conditions to subject to comprehensive consideration the problem of ethnic minority rights, including the sound state guarantees of their development, the preservation of their uniqueness and the expansion of opportunities for their self-expression.

For the beginning, we believe it would be to the point to organise a European-scale seminar on problems of inter-ethnic relations. A great importance attaches today to the problem of youth rights, the creation of optimum opportunities for contacts, exchanges, study and creative efforts. We hold it useful to think about how favorable conditions can be secured for the development of each people's creative potential and to look for joint efforts to respond to such a challenge of the times as the brain drain. Collective wisdom is also required to settle refugee affairs.

The Soviet delegation intends to act strictly in accordance with the working rules of the present conference. Yesterday we told the conference in great detail how the Soviet Union implements the Vienna Accords. We expect other delegations to act likewise. We believe that human rights and their observance is a very responsible and serious problem. They call for thoroughness, a high level of legal and political culture and the inadmissibility of double standards.

Meets With Danish Officials

LD0906214190 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Kiselev]

[Text] Copenhagen June 9 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy, who is attending the second CSCE conference on human dimension, met with Irish Foreign Minister Gerard Collins and Danish Acting Foreign Minister Mr Hokonsen. He informed them of Soviet evaluations of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington.

It was pointed out during the two conversations that a new climate of cooperation that is taking shape in Soviet-American relations favours the joint efforts of countries in the quest for solutions to world and European problems.

Petrovskiy also held political consultations at the Danish Foreign Ministry. Matters connected with the strengthening of global and regional security structures were considered and areas for Soviet-Danish cooperation at the United Nations and other international forums were mapped out during the consultations.

Ligachev's Stockholm News Conference Reported

PM1206133390 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 9 Jun 90 p 5

[Torgny Hinnemo report: "Ligachev Optimistic About Communism"]

[Text] Yegor Ligachev has not given up hope of a future for communism—even in Sweden.

He was especially moved by the fact that the employees of the Royal Library preserve the memory of Lenin's visit and can still show you where he sat and worked.

"I hope that this reflects the attitude of the Swedish public," the Soviet Politburo member said at a news conference at the Soviet Embassy in Stockholm yesterday.

Ligachev is a member of the highest leadership of the CPSU and is currently responsible for agricultural questions. His visit to Sweden was because he wanted to study Swedish agriculture in particular.

He finds Swedish agricultural controls interesting, despite the fact that at present the Riksdag is the process of abolishing them.

"We have a shortage of agricultural products whereas you have a surplus. When we, too, have a surplus we will make a new study visit to Sweden," Ligachev said.

However, he stressed repeatedly that there can be no question of copying the Swedish model since Sweden and the Soviet Union belong to two different social systems, the capitalist and the socialist.

Ligachev is, he said, in favor of a multiparty system in the Soviet Union but remains a Communist like "my comrades" in the leadership. His philosophy is that the Communist Party will retain its position through hard work and by leading the country through a democratization and shake-up of the economy.

However, he categorically rejected private ownership of large sections of Soviet industry and commerce.

"We are continuing to build on socially owned means of production."

However, there is room for a differentiation of various forms of state property, Ligachev said. For example, those farmers who want to will be able to run their farms independently, but they will not be allowed to own the land.

What has impressed Ligachev and his companions most of all is the high technical standard of Swedish agriculture and the Swedish food industry. But, despite ideological differences, there are also economic arrangements which Ligachev considers worth thinking about.

"There is hardly a Swede who does not belong to some sort of cooperative."

And the cooperative movement, like the Swedish institutions for social security, could serve to a large extent as a model for a future socialist Soviet Union, Yegor Ligachev said.

'Foreign' Submarines in Swedish Waters Viewed

LD0706152790 Moscow TASS in English 1506 GMT 7 Jun 90

[By TASS political news analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow June 7 TASS—The Swedish press often reported on "foreign submarines" in Swedish territorial

waters, but when the rumours were not confirmed, local newspapers dropped the story.

But it seems THE WALL STREET JOURNAL decided to follow in the Swedish media's footsteps.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL reported that an "unidentified submarine" was spotted in Swedish waters. The report creates the impression that it was a Soviet submarine.

The pretext for THE WALL STREET JOURNAL's new propaganda sally was manoeuvres by Swedish naval forces in the Baltic, when started on May 15.

With a reference to commander-in-chief of the Swedish Armed Forces, General Gustavsson, the newspaper writes that an unidentified submarine was discovered in Swedish waters and that special units of the Swedish anti-submarine defences started firing depth charges at the submarine.

The submarine has not surfaced however. The newspaper suggests that perhaps the enemy has become more cautious.

General Gustavsson said he cannot confirm the report about a mysterious submarine. However that did not stop the editors of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL from printing the story.

Swedish Media Overdramatize Hijacker's Handling

PM1206124790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent M. Zubko dispatch: "Hijacker Under Guard"; first paragraph is an introduction]

[Text] As already reported by IZVESTIYA (issue No. 161), D. Semenov, a 17-year-old polytechnical college student from the city of Zhodino, forced the crew of a TU-154 aircraft to change course on the night of 8-9 June and to fly to Sweden by threatening to blow the plane up. Our Stockholm correspondent M. Zubko reports on the further development of events connected with the hijacking.

Stockholm—A number of Swedish newspapers are clearly overdramatizing the problem of handing the hijacker over to the Soviet Union, claiming that airborne terrorists are always sentenced to death in our country for such crimes. These publications are thereby trying to arouse sympathy for the hijacker here. They appear to have forgotten that terrorists who were returned to the Soviet Union by Israel quite recently received quite a different punishment.

Last Sunday [10 June] saw the first session of the Stockholm court which resolved the question of whether to detain D. Semenov or not while his fate was being decided. The verdict passed was to keep him in detention. The terrorist was handcuffed in the court building. The hijacker's lawyer requested that his client be given expert psychiatric counselling.

French Defense Minister Favors Changes in NATO

LD0706225390 Moscow TASS in English 2236 GMT 7 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Igor Kuleshov]

[Text] Paris June 7 TASS—French Defence Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement spoke in favour of the evolution of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, which, according to him, must proceed taking into account new realities but retaining the basis of balance in Europe.

The communique, released on Thursday, of the hearings on Wednesday in the National Assembly Foreign Affairs Commission, noted that the minister reiterated the principles of the French defence policy arguing that the preservation of the minimum and independent nuclear deterrence force was a factor of stability on the European Continent.

Links between Europe and the United States, which are a stabilizing element, he said, must be preserved, but the legitimate security interest of the Soviet Union must be taken into account.

Responding to questions, Chevenement told the commission that over the past year the Central Defence Administration had reviewed its tasks, organizational structures and budget aiming to raise the efficiency of that body dealing with intelligence and counterintelligence.

Civil Defense Accord Signed With France

LD0906221690 Moscow TASS in English 2110 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksey Yemelyanov]

[Text] Paris June 10 TASS—The visit to France by a Soviet delegation led by General of the Army Vladimir Govorov, civil defence chief and deputy defence minister of the USSR, ended on Saturday with the signing of a protocol to the treaty on cooperation between the Soviet Union and France in the field of civil defense.

"The accord which we signed on June 9 is indisputably important," French Interior Minister Pierre Joxe told journalists. "This accord envisages in particular regular exchanges of information on respective matters, joint training of civil defense specialists and mutual assistance in the elimination of the aftermaths of natural calamities or technological disasters."

"But the laconic lines of the agreement conceal more important, universal human criteria: cooperation in rendering assistane to people, towards whom our treaty is mainly oriented. Soviet-French cooperation in civil defense already had specific manifestations prior to the signing of this document," Joxe said.

"More than 450 French rescuers and various specialists actively participated in eliminating the aftermaths of the devastating earthquake in Armenia.

"In other words, our agreement documentarily seals the established close Soviet-French civil defence cooperation which the sides consider it necessary to develop in every way."

"Suffice it to recall such tragic disasters as Chernobyl, Armenia, and others," General Govorov told journalists, "to understand the importance of the documents signed."

"From the viewpoint of priorities, this accord envisages primarily the broadest cooperation in protecting the population in emergency, extreme conditions.

"The protocol signed envisages exchanges of information on matters concerning the preparation of the population for possible actions in this kind of situations, as well as exchanges of experience in the training of specialists capable of rendering help precisely in disastrous situation conditions."

"Soviet-French civil defense cooperation is of importance to both France and the Soviet Union," Hubert Fournier, head of the civil safety board of the French Interior Ministry, told TASS.

"The exchange of experience in such a serious matter and mutual assistance in eliminating the consequences of natural and technological disasters signifies an opportunity to save as many lives as possible.

"Contacts with Soviet representatives were extremely useful and fruitful. They enabled us to determine not only the scope of cooperation but also specific ways to practise it."

Bakatin Meets With French Assembly President

PM0506132990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS "Official Report"]

[Text] On 31 May V.V. Bakatin, member of the Presidential Council and USSR minister of internal affairs, had a conversation with French National Assembly President L. Fabius.

The conversation participants exchanged information on crime prevention activities and the development of interparliamentary links between the USSR and France.

Icelandic President Finnbogadottir Arrives

PM1106151390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 90
Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Arrival in Moscow"]

[Text] Icelandic President V. Finnbogadottir arrived in the Soviet Union on an unofficial visit 9 June.

She was met at the airport by A.S. Dzasokhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, and other officials.

Meets With Ryzhkov

LD1106100890 Moscow TASS in English 1002 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov met here today President Vigdis Finnbogadottir of Iceland, who is currently paying an unofficial visit to the Soviet Union.

Ryzhkov told the president that the Soviet Union highly appreciated Iceland's role in the organisation of the 1986 Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik, which marked the beginning of a radical turn towards better world relations. The name of the Icelandic capital has become part and parcel of the international vocabulary as a symbol of new political thinking.

The sides confirmed their mutual interest in deepening Soviet-Icelandic cooperation and further developing the traditional areas of bilateral trade—the import of Icelandic fish products and wool and the export to Iceland of power carriers, passenger cars and other goods.

The sides also noted the desirability of promoting economic, scientific and technological relations, including the ecologically clean utilisation of geothermal sources of energy, technological cooperation in basic branches of industry, fishing and other domains.

They also noted the importance of contacts in humanitarian and cultural spheres both on bilateral and multilateral lines.

Finnbogadottir said she regarded in this light her participation in the opening of the exhibition of Scandinavian painting in Leningrad and of modern Icelandic art in Moscow.

The Icelandic president wished the Soviet leadership and people success in their radical political and socio-economic reforms.

Austrian Chancellor Reaffirms Neutrality Status

LD0606122390 Moscow TASS in English 1158 GMT 6 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna June 6 TASS—"The meeting between the Soviet and American presidents made an important contribution to the stabilisation of world peace," Austrian Federal Chancellor Franz Vranitzky said in an interview with the NEUE KRONEN-ZEITUNG newspaper.

"The Soviet-American summit," he noted, "was marked by an atmosphere of cordiality and openness. The east-while mistrust in relations between the two great powers has yielded ground to purposeful cooperation. The enemy image has practically disappeared. This largely contributed to the debate on the future of the North Atlantic Alliance and the Warsaw Treaty. This is why Austria, which scrupulously honours its neutrality, sees no reason to join a military alliance in any form within the framework of the emerging new Europe."

Zholkver Analyzes Results of Thatcher Visit

LD1106214590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Political observer Aleksandr Zholkver commentary, from the "International Diary" program, presented by Boris Parkhomenko]

[Excerpts] [Parkhomenko] The international mass information media, primarily the British press, is commenting widely on the results of the visit to the Soviet Union by British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. I asked Aleksandr Zholkver, our political observer, to analyze these commentaries:

[Zholkver] To summarize, the general tone of response of the British press is very positive. THE TIMES writes that Thatcher fully backs Gorbachev, while THE DAILY TELEGRAPH altogether considers that Anglo-Soviet relations have never been better. What specifically are they talking about? It is noted, above all, that the Soviet-British dialogue, even at the summit level, already has become an indispensable and essential element in international policy. The most diverse problems are being discussed in the course of it. And although the points of view of the two sides do not coincide in all cases, trust, openness, and readiness to interact are being expanded. Let us take, for example, the economic aspects of our interaction. At the Moscow news conference, one of my colleagues inquired about the new forms which could emerge in the economic sphere. Mrs. Thatcher replied, to my mind quite reasonably, that it is not at all necessary to search for some new ways, but it is necessary persistently to proceed in the direction already established. [passage omitted] It is far more important, I think, to make sure that those joint enterprises that have been set up are functioning effectively, and are not just represented on paper, than to keep setting up new enterprises. Here I wholly agree with our guest, who underlines that the problem is to change people's atttitudes which apply to a different economy. In this respect, I consider the proposals of the British prime minister to cooperate in training our specialists in the processes of management within the market economy to be very useful, and not only in the sphere of production, but also in the sphere of preserving what has been produced already, and putting it on the market.

It seems to me that in order to make cooperation between our countries more effective, it is necessary to overcome the psychological barriers established between our countries over the cold war years. That is why, in my view, the dialogue taking place between our countries on the most acute international problems, including the question of German unification, is very important. It is known that we have different approaches to this. Mrs. Thatcher here again has advocated the united Germany's membership in NATO. At the same time, she has stated that she understands the necessity of providing a guarantee to the Soviet Union that its security will be ensured.

It was in this spirit that the British head of government spoke at the session of the NATO Council in Scotland, where it was stated that—I quote—NATO extends to the Soviet Union and all other European counties the hand of friendship and cooperation. If one adds to this that the next meeting of the NATO countries' heads of government is set for the start of July in London, one can imagine that it will to no small degree depend upon Britain whether these words will be followed by specific deeds in the direction of the transition from confrontation to cooperation, and from bloc thinking to the creation of all-European security structures. [passage omitted]

Latin America & Caribbean

Cuban Minister Condemns U.S. 'Provocations'

LD0706153990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Interview with Jose Raul Viera, Cuban first deputy foreign minister, by commentator Yuriy Isayev at the Cuban Embassy in Moscow; date not given; Isayev remarks live with Viera responses recorded in Spanish with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Isayev] This conversation was held at the Cuban Embassy, and I have already covered some aspects of it, such as the future of Soviet-Cuban economic relations. We also talked there about the fact that a large group of Soviet children who suffered in the Chernobyl accident will soon spend several months in Cuba, where local specialists will give them the necessary help.

But during our conversation we also dealt, perfectly naturally, with a new provocation by the United States against Cuba. That is just how the world community has described the start of broadcasting by the TV Marti television station.

[Viera] In order to denigrate our dignity, the Americans gave the subversive station the name of the Cuban national hero, Jose Marti. In this way Cuba's sovereignty was violated and an invasion was launched against its television frequencies. We are not against the free dissemination of information, but that station broadcasts on the frequencies of the 13th national channel, on which our programs are carried in Havana. We have already presented our protest to the International Telecommunication Union in Geneva, which pointed out to

the United States that its actions are illegal. But in spite of that, the programs are continuing. The Cuban Government has been obliged to take defensive measures in response and introduce interference. Thus, the signal from the United States no longer gets onto the 13th channel.

[Isayev] Of course, it is a disgraceful act. I even imagined this nonsensical situation for a moment. Some foreign station, an impostor, suddenly appears on our screens at 2100 in place of the "Vremya" program. Therefore, one cannot only understand the Cubans' indignation, but also join in with it.

But there are other forms of provocation too. They form the arsenal of the past, the logic of gunboats and trained military muscle, with which they constantly intimidate sovereign states:

[Viera] Military manouvers off Cuba's shores prompt anxiety amoung our people. Recently, three operations have been staged simultaneously. A training air strike against the island was conducted with B-52 aircraft. The evacuation of civilian personnel from the base at Guantanamo proceeded in parallel, while the base itself was put onto a state of increased combat readiness. Exercises known as Solid Shield took place at the very same time. Elite subunits practised landings and seizing Puerto Rico. A military armada was located off the coast of Cuba and could have changed its direction of attack at any moment.

Therefore, we ask this perfectly legitimate question: If detente is going on in the world, if the Soviet Union is cutting its forces, and if, as western rulers admit, the Warsaw Pact no longer represents a danger to them, then on what basis is the United States performing all these games off the coast of Cuba, threatening our sovereignty?

Soviet-Cuban Economic Cooperation Meeting Opens

LD0606084190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2023 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Havana, 6 Jun (TASS)—The first meeting of the working group to improve the mechanisms of economic cooperation between the USSR and the Republic of Cuba opened on Tuesday in the Cuban capital. The Soviet delegation is headed by Konstantin Katushev, USSR minister for foreign economic relations, and the Cuban by Ricardo Cabrisas Ruiz, the Republic's minister of foreign trade.

Soviet-Cuban cooperation in the sphere of the economy is very large-scale and complementary, Yevgeniy Osadchuk, USSR deputy minister for foreign economic relations, told a TASS correspondent in an interview. Now, when very great changes are taking place in the world as a whole, and in CEMA member-countries in particular, major changes are required in economic links as well. The aim of the current meeting is to determine a mechanism that would be in accord with the demands of the world market, with the particular features of the economic policies of the USSR and Cuba, and with the specific character of their cooperation.

Economic Cooperation To Improve

LD1006030790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1008 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Sergey Staroselskiy]

[Text] Havana, 9 Jun (TASS)—The first session of the working group to improve economic cooperation mechanisms between the Soviet Union and Cuba has ended in Havana.

As Konstantin Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations, said in an interview with your TASS correspondent, the session of the working group discussed an issue which is topical today not only in the Soviet Union's relations with Cuba, but also with the order CEMA member countries: the transition to a new system of trade and economic cooperation, a system based on assessing the value of goods delivered to each other at current world prices and settling accounts in freely convertible currency.

The potential of the Cuban economy, the minister continued, is, unfortunately, insufficient to balance our export and import relations. Therefore, we are using certain types of credit. It is these very problems that have made it difficult to elaborate a mechanism to ensure a transition to a new system of trade within the framework of mutually advantageous cooperation. As a result of the first round of talks we reached agreement that such a transition is inescapable. Second, without yet setting ourselves the hard goal of reaching final results in terms of figures, we managed on many points to harmonize methods of tackling the problems, which we have to solve.

The transition to a new system creates favorable conditions for further developing trade and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Cuba, K. Katushev noted. In recent years the Cuban side has made a good start, which is capable of providing a yield in supplies of export goods to the Soviet Union. It is planned, in particular, to produce medical preparations, and at a very high standard: on the level of discoveries in the fields of pharmacology, diagnostic equipment, and biological products.

Kvitsinskiy, Komplektov Confer With Cuba's Viera

PM0806135390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Morning Edition p4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A meeting has taken place between USSR deputy foreign ministers V.G. Komplektov and Yu.A. Kvitsinskiy and Cuban First Deputy Foreign Minister J.R.

Viera, who is in Moscow for scheduled political consultations. In an atmosphere of friendly mutual understanding, the sides exchanged opinions on key international and regional problems, including the situation in Central America and on the European continent.

During the consultations, the sides confirmed their mutual interest in maintaining a working political dialogue, in view of the dynamic processes taking place in the modern world, which demand constructive collaboration between all states.

Castro Receives Soviet Delegation 5 June

LD0606121690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0609 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Havana, 6 Jun (TASS)—Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee, chairman of the State Council and of the Council of Ministers of the Republic, yesterday received the Soviet delegation which is led by Yuriy Yukalov, the head of the African Countries Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry. The delegation took part in the eighth meeting of the joint commission on supervising the settling of the situation in South-Western Africa, which took place in the capital of Cuba.

An involved conversation concerning the future of the settling of the internal conflict in Angola and other regional problems of the African continent took place.

Carlos Aldana, member of the Secretariat of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee, and Lev Metlitskiy, charge d'affaires of the USSR ad interim in the Republic of Cuba, took part in the conversation.

Castro on Commitment to 'Socialism or Death'

PM0606144190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "'Socialism or Death!'"]

[Text] Havana, 4 Jun—"Socialism is the essence of the revolution in Cuba; it is impossible to imagine the country's independence, sovereignty, or future without it," Cuban leader Fidel Castro has said. Addressing Havana construction workers here on Sunday, he stressed that "the Republic's people will never permit capitalism to return, which is why Cubans have chosen the slogan 'Socialism or Death!'"

"One of the hopes nurtured by imperialism," F. Castro said, "resides in the fact that Cuba has been deprived of vital resources owing to the internal problems being experienced by the Soviet Union and the countries of East Europe. However, the revolution cannot be defeated either on the battlefield or in the economic sphere."

Mayorov Discusses Delay of Noriega's Trial

LD1106133290 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] The United States' aggression against Panama last December resulted in hundreds of killed and wounded and in material damage worth millions of dollars, and the only justification for it was the removal from power of General Noriega, whom Washington accused of being involved in drugs trafficking. Noriega has been removed from power and is in the hands of American justice. What next? Here is what Radio Moscow commentator Mikhail Mayorov writes.

There still hasn't been any trial. Why? THE NEW YORK TIMES says that among the papers found at Noriega's residence there weren't any which could prove convincingly his involvement in the drugs trade. The whole story with seizing the former Panamanian leader puzzled and alarmed many people even then, to say nothing about today. Well, was the arrest of Noriega a mistake? But he was seized not in a New York suburb but in the capital of a sovereign country, and taking part in the operation were not policemen but scores of thousands of Marines.

But let's call things by their real names. General Noriega was seized through an open aggression with all the aftermath resulting from it to small Panama, and we've already mentioned what it has meant to the country. The action was condemned by world community, and at that time nobody doubted America's version of Noriega's guilt. But what will happen now if the charges are found groundless?

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet Reviews Economic Program

LD1306073990 Moscow TASS in English 0721 GMT 13 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow June 13 TASS—Soviet lawmakers blasted the government economic reform package here today, as the parliament resumed discussion of a controversial plan to put the Soviet economy on market rails.

The programme was presented to the USSR Supreme Soviet on May 24 and was followed by a debate that lasted for several days.

The overwhelming majority of the deputies favoured the transition to a market, but criticised the government proposal to raise prices. The government proposal boils down to one-time price hikes and does not necessarily mean radical economic reforms, they said.

Some deputies even insisted on putting the government to a vote of confidence, a proposal rejected by most of their colleagues.

A proposed draft resolution on the government programme also met with a mixed reaction. It was submitted when the parliament wound up its debate on May 29.

Today, the Supreme Soviet will discuss an amended version of the resolution, prepared by several parliamentary committees.

Supreme Soviet Decision on Gorbachev Visit

LD1306082990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1720 GMT 12 Jun 90

['Full text' of the decision of the Soviet parliament on the visits of Gorbachev to the United States and Canada, 12 Jun]

[Text] Moscow, 12 Jun (TASS)— The USSR Supreme Soviet:

Notes the Soviet-U.S. summit is a major event in the process of the deep positive changes in Europe and in the world. The mutual understanding and interaction of the two great states have been reflected in a number of practical steps. Of fundamental significance are the creation of the prerequisites for signing this year, between the USSR and the United States, a treaty on the 50-percent reduction of strategic nuclear arms, and in the same year—at a pan-European summit—a treaty on the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces in Europe and a Soviet-U.S. trade agreement. The atmosphere, content, and character of the meeting affirm the vital importance of the policy of new thinking, which has focused in itself the hopes of mankind for dismantling the militaristic and psychological heritage of the "cold war." The prospect for entering a qualitatively new stage in Soviet-U.S. relations, based on interaction and partnership for the good of the peoples of the two countries and the world community, is opening up;

Instructs the USSR Supreme Soviet committees and the commissions of its chambers to analyze the aspects of Soviet-U.S. agreements and understandings that are within their competence, to make the appropriate decisions on them, and to lend assistance in their practical implementation;

In light of the new possibilities created by the summit, to adopt measures for further developing and perfecting interparliamentary ties with the United States and Canada.

The USSR Supreme Soviet instructs the USSR Council of Ministers, the relevant ministries and departments and recommends enterprises, associations, and organizations to adopt the necessary measures to timely and competently implement everything laid down in the Soviet-U.S. and Soviet-Canadian agreements, and other documents and statements, signed for the benefit of Soviet people and the development of healthy international relations.

The USSR Supreme Soviet favors the establishment and development of new forms of economic and humanitarian cooperation between the USSR and the United States, and the countries of East and West Europe in the interests of the more active participation of the USSR in interaction in the international arena.

The USSR Supreme Soviet expresses the hope that the North Atlantic alliance will react adequately to the declaration of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty participant states, which was adopted in Moscow on 7 June and is aimed at overcoming military confrontation and the bloc model of security, and at further developing the Helsinki process. The transformation of both alliances and the regulation of their interaction could play a vital role in the creation of new structures of pan-European security, in the synchronization of the European process, and the unification of Germany, and promote the coordination of other questions of the transitional period and the elaboration of mutually acceptable decisions on defining the military and political status of a united Germany. The USSR Supreme Soviet believes it advisable to hear at its autumn session the report of the Soviet representatives of the provisional commission of government plenipotentiaries on the review of the character, functions, and activity of the Warsaw Treaty.

[signed] Chairman USSR Supreme Soviet A. Lukyanov

Moscow, Kremlin.

12 June 1990.

Committee Disbands Military Construction Units

LD1206195590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 12 Jun 90

[From the "Vrmeya" newscast]

[Text] Farewell, construction battalion! Yesterday, the people's deputies, members of the Committee of Defense and National State Security of the Supreme Soviet could say this with every satisfaction when they adopted a decision on the disbandment of military construction units deployed in the national economy. It was precisely on this question that an acute debate arouse. At the present moment, it was stressed during the debate, 501 military construction formations, with an overall strength of 329,000 men, are engaged in the construction of national economic projects under the direction of 20 ministries and departments. These formations are not being used effectively, frequently not according to their designation, and as a rule in subordinate and low-paid work.

The deputies drew attention to the fact that the existence of military construction units in civilian ministries and departments is unconstitutional. The Committee for Defense and State Security adopted a decision to present for the examination of the USSR Supreme Soviet a proposal to suspend the call-up of military reservist construction units due to be sent to the national economy, commencing in the fall of 1990, with the exception of military construction detachments whch are under the direction of a number of ministries and departments, where it is recommended that military construction formations be disbanded beginning 1 January 1992. [video shows committee in session, including Akhromeyev]

Ryzhkov To Present Economic Program 13 Jun

LD1206212690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 12 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Tomorrow, [13 Jun] after almost three months of discussion in committees and commissions, the deputies of the Union's Parliament will listen to the prime minister, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, who will present to the Supreme Soviet the reworked governmental program for the changeover of the economy to the regulated market.

Supreme Soviet Approves Law on Freedom of Press

LD1206154390 Moscow TASS in English 1533 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Andrey Orlov and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow June 12 TASS—Soviet parliament today passed the law on the press and other news media, the first legal act in Soviet history to give detailed guarantees of freedom of the press and the rights of journalists. Until now freedom of the press was only declared in the Soviet Constitution.

The law sets down the procedure for creating news media, their relationship with the state and citizens, as well as relationship between the founder, the publisher and the editor.

Under the law, the right to establish news media belongs not only to state and public organisations, political parties and various associations, but also to any Soviet citizen who is 18 years old. This provision prompted especially keen debates. However it was agreed that the right to establish a publication is one of the main democratic freedoms envisaged in the international convenants on human rights, which the Soviet Union joined, and it is necessary to enforce them.

The law states explicitly that "censorship of mass information is not permitted." Commenting on this provision, Boris Nikolskiy, deputy chairman of the parliament committee on glasnost, stressed that responsibility for divulging secret information will rest with those who leak it rather than with the mass media.

The law establishes officials may face criminal charges for hampering the legitimate professional activity of journalists, and for forcing them to distribute or to refuse to distribute information. It also contains a number of specific guarantees for the rights of journalists. In particular, the journalist has the right to refuse to prepare materials which run counter to his or her convictions, as well as to sign material, which was distorted during editing.

Tomorrow the two chambers of the Supreme Soviet will hold a joint session to discuss a draft resolution on the government's concept for transition to a regulated market economy.

Supreme Soviet Abolishes Press Censorship

AU1206154690 Paris AFP in English 1454 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 12 (AFP)—The Soviet Parliament enacted a law Tuesday abolishing press censorship, it was reported here. The new law, which also contains a clause defining defamation, was approved clause-by-clause by a massive majority of Supreme Soviet members. The law was passed with 374 votes in favour, nine abstentions, and no votes against.

The new law stipulates in its first clause that "censorship of the media is not permitted." Also, for the first time in the Soviet Union any individual can launch a new newspaper, radio or television station. At present, all newspapers in the Soviet Union are "social organisations," most of them belonging to the Communist Party.

Gorbachev Answers Deputies Questions 12 Jun

LD1206185890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0708 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Question and answer session with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin—questions read by Gorbachev; live]

[Text] And now for the questions: There is a question on why I did not name Comrade Ismailov among those who helped and participated. [laughs] There are many people whom I have not named, but I should say that Comrade Ismailov played an active part, and when I arrived from Canada...[changes thought] It is my custom that some comrades leave early to hold a very intensive and far-reaching dialogue on television, at various meetings, at scientific centers, at meetings with sociologists. In short, there is a huge program. Anyway, he was one of the deputies who, when we met up very late in the evening, made some very interesting points based on the observations he had made during his conversations and contacts.

Well, for those I haven't named, I apologize. There is a whole list, although it was right to remind me.

Comrade Koltsov asks: The U.S. President said, in his report to congress in March 1990, that the United States has rejected our proposal for talks on reducing naval forces. The same report sets out the arguments for the unacceptable nature of these cuts for the United States. The question: Does this mean that this U.S. stance is forcing us to develop our Navy further and, above all, to improve our large aircraft carriers? Comrade Koltsov.

I think that the matter is developing, the process is continuing, in such a way that one way or another we will come to these types of armaments in subsequent stages as well. Now, at the first stage of the Vienna talks, naval forces have been postponed until the next stage. I have to say, however, that I said in jest to the Americans and to President Bush as well, that there has always been a great predominance of those who used to serve in the U.S. Navy among the administration. Mr. Bush himself was, after all, a naval pilot. This no doubt always has an effect during the discussions. They have, as it were, a protected zone, and it is hard to get at it, etc. No, I personally can understand this, and I think that it is so for the entire military, as well as people who are more or less experienced. They don't have to be such great specialists. I understand.

What the society of the United States consumes, demands the input of vast resources from all over the world on a regular basis. In order to maintain these communciations of vital importance for the United States—which can not be interrupted for a single day—it is natural that they see the Navy as a very important component of general policy, not to mention the fact that it is, of course, also an important component in military confrontations. All the same, I do think that at subsequent stages—we don't need to make guesses—when this continues, we will come to this favorite baby of the U.S. administration.

I have not answered the second part on whether this means we should carry on too. I think we are doing so, and we will do what we think is necessary within the framework of the Navy.

Comrade Gryazin just shook his head. He is saying: There you are, see, the money will go off somewhere again! [murmuring from the hall] But I did not say aircraft carriers. The question really does mention them but I said we will do whatever we need to do.

We ask that we, the Supreme Soviet and the people's deputies, be told how much can be channelled into social programs from the budget as a result of the signing of the accords to cut strategic weapons, chemical weapons, etc. We also ask you to tell us by how great a percentage the military budget will fall in connection with the said accords.

Comrade (Moshnyaga) looks at the root of the matter, and we are looking at this too, because generally we are really pursuing two aims in dealing with and implementing the principles of a new foreign policy, what we call the new thinking. The first is the creation of necessary, favorable external conditions for those tasks we are tackling within the country and, in general, the preservation of peace with the aim of solving the common task of civilization; the survival of mankind. This is the first thing.

Second, of course, we want to unburden our economy. No other economy is as overburdened as ours because if you compare that we have guaranteed strategic parity with such a large country that produces at least twice as much as we do, by the most modest calculations, then this means that it is affected half as much. And indeed, it has always been five, eight percent at most. Occasionally, in specific years—I think when Mr. Reagan arrived—it was 10 percent, relative to the level of the preceding year—that sort of level, overall. While here it was as much as 16 percent, 18 percent, or 20 percent of the national income.

I think, comrades, that we will examine all this together and will act sensibly so as to solve the two tasks at once. They are two sides of the same coin. We cannot jeopardize the security of the people and the country, but how are we to tackle it? I do not want to expand on this now but it will not always be through rubber-stamping tanks. We have rubber-stamped so many of them, and now we wonder what to do with them... Nor will we hurry to [changes thought] Here we need above all to guarantee quality, and it is from this point of view that everything that is connected with military science and with preventing a lag in scientific research that work must be resolved here. As for increasing armaments themselves, we shall be carrying out this task according to other criteria. So, we shall be discussing this together.

It is too early to say precisely what form this will take, but I have to say that the figures will be large. It is coming about, however, that that most important matter here, our approach to conversion, must be very thorough now. If we were to continue preserving—and thank God, as they say, we have already spotted how many foolish things we did in the initial stage when active and good fixed assets, and the cadre potential of our military and industrial complex, let us say, or the defense sector, began to be used as garbage—it will, of course, be a great failure. But fortunately, we have recognized all of this now and very interesting programs are beginning to emerge here at present. I think that soon, generally speaking, first in the government and then at the level of the Supreme Soviet, we shall have to arrive at a national conversion program that will take into account the possibilities of the defense sector for solving our tasks and problems, which have come about in connection with our economy's about-turn toward the individual.

Comrades Kuznetsov or Kuznetsova and Tikhonenkov ask—evidently from Kazakhstan—they ask if any global ecological problems were a topic during our talks with the President. Yes they were, comrades. Moreover, they were viewed from the perspective that we must now cooperate on these questions, and specific questions of cooperation in at least two areas have already been specifically designated, namely the European area and the Arctic—we touched on this in Canada and in the United States—especially regarding technology, regarding technology. And in this respect there is a second question: Is there any danger, from the ecological standpoint, from implementing the Tingiz deposit project? No, comrades, a thorough study was undertaken here, and what is proposed is a very interesting technology which will enable us, generally speaking, to master this—and maybe later use it in other places as well.

Nikolay Vasilyevich Neyland says that, at the press conference with Mitterrand, I put forward the idea of a united Germany's membership in NATO in the same way as France, in the same way as France—to be in the political oraganization without entering the military organization. Well, in the first place, during more profound study—and this was talked about with the President, especially at Camp David, where a degree of openness, as it were, had already been achieved—you know, all this was revealed as a myth. In general, NATO's plans take into account France's Armed Forces. And I think that, in addition, the intelligence service has told us about this. That's in the first place.

Second, the fact that we are now going toward such a scenario, I think, makes it more reliable. If, look, the first reaction at the Political Consultative Committee session is to reform our treaty in that direction—moreover quickly, they will develop it strongly within the space of a year, and change the structure. So on the basis of that defensive doctrine which has been developed and established, and if the ministers of foreign affairs who are preparing the NATO summit meeting in July in London, have found it necessary and expedient to respond—and moreover, you will recall that this address has been drawn up in a very positive manner—if this is followed by practical deeds, I have in mind, and this was the subject of particular criticism from our side, then in point of fact we cannot fail to see that the West considers that movement should be only from our side. It is for this reason that I spoke briefly on this. I let slip one phrase: The West has to change as well—and by the way, these changes are already in progress. And there are plenty of problems there, so that these changes might proceed. When the President and I were flying from Camp David in a helicopter, and I was looking at a suburb of Washington, [I said to myself] what kind of suburb is this, who lives there, how much does such a house cost, and so on. Well, the houses are not at our prices! And then the President himself came over to what I was saying. Well, what is this? If such houses are being built and bought, well, do you have a lot of them here? No, he said. I have to say, Mr. President, that there are plenty of our own problems in America. This is maybe at a different level, but very many, and we need this kind of policy which we are now...[changes thought] I am afraid even to approach some of the problems, the President said. They exist both from the internal and foreign point of view.

So then, regarding your question. Once this atmosphere of confidentiality had arisen—that's how we talked—the matter looked like this, comrades: If we advance along the road NATO is to take, and which the Political Consultative Committee has taken, the possibility of concluding an agreement really opens up. Incidentally, we have already spoken at the practical level with Mrs. Thatcher, and even thought about the structure of this declaration and what it would enshrine. That is the first thing. In this way, the fulcrum for military confrontation today, given changes in both blocs and in the doctrine and structure of the Armed Forces, and a reduction based on the Vienna talks and their transformation into political organizations, opens up the possibility that on the basis of these already existing structures, these same all-European security structures could be started. We wondered why there should not be some kind of supra-union body that would implement and monitor reports, exchanges, and the degree of trust, and a whole series of proposals arose at this. Why should not obligations be retained on both sides, not to mention that the Bundeswehr should be cut correspondingly, that it be part of NATO, while in the GDR, troops that had also been cut must belong to the central government and not be an element of NATO. And our troops...[changes thought] When you make a whole list, a new kind of associative form is obtained which must be thought through further, and we will do so. Concrete problems are already accumulating which could change this and, most importantly, it will be synchronized with the process of building all-European structures, regarding the economy, a legal space, a cultural space, and the military sphere: security. We said this—we are not claiming that

this was our version. Let it come from anyone...Mrs. Thatcher...whoever, as long as it corresponds to our common interests.

Does the second question, well, require an answer or not? No.

There will be an answer, Nikolay Vasilyevich.

Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, there has been no war in Europe for more than 40 years. There has been no war precisely because there was a nuclear deterrent. It must be acknowledged that this was ensured at the expense of the health of those living around the Semipalatinsk test site. How can the social losses of the people living in the test site zones be compensated? (Comrade Dzhumatova).

Well, it seems to me, that like you, we are carefully investigating. Not one concern will be overlooked. All our science, not just the defense specialists, but our great science is involved in this. You now have an organization which, I think, is headed by...[prompting from the floor] Suleymenov, isn't it? Suleymenov.

In any case, I think that what is being reported here can also be reported to the Supreme Soviet. Objectively speaking, everything has been very much tightened up and made strict there, and the frequency has been altered and reduced.

In any case, we now can say that this is being tackled in earnest, and, anything else if it needs to be examined. I understand that probably, the desire is to close it. We are moving towards this, but until it is closed, we need to do everything to ensure that people are protected from all chance occurrences. This must be totally excluded. This, strictly speaking, is being done, and this is being monitored by both the President and the government.

Comrade Kirillov has asked the question. Do you not sense the need for depoliticizing the Soviet Army in view of German unification, the German dual membership of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the political changes in the Warsaw Pact countries, and also the inevitable coming to power of various parties in various republics of our union? No I do not. [laughter in hall]

Comrade Nazarenko asks two questions. The first: Nakhodka has been named as a free enterprise zone. Does this mean that such zones cannot be set up in other places in the country? No it does not. I think life will show where else there will be such a need. In one case it may be in trade, in border ties; in another case it might be in joint ventures. Evidently this would be a main area. And I think they may arise in individual cases, although there are various views on this matter. But it can only happen in cases where everyone is in agreement. When everyone is in agreement. I recall, it seems, that people wanted it in Novgorod, or was it in Pskov? In Novgorod. And considerable contradictions arose there, so to speak. That is already a different matter. Here, one must come to an agreement. It can only be on the basis of the agreement of all.

And the second question is on conversion: Is there an accord on the exchange of experience on this problem? In any case we spoke about this, and even spoke about jointly implementing this at certain enterprises, at certain enterprises. As for the joint project—if it succeeds—it is proceeding with difficulty, but it is very interesting and promising. By this I mean the airplane. We are building a plane. We are cooperating with U.S. firms over the engine and part of the equipment, and Israel is participating over the cabin equipment. And its prospects are very good. This plane is needed in the world. It will have an enormous market. Calculations show...what is it, Comrade Yuriy Alekseyevich, Comrade Ryzhov? A rough calculation shows...is it 5 billion rubles or 10 billion rubles that is given as the gain we can make? [indistinct voice from hall says: "This is the long-term."]

Comrade Desyatov from Komsomolsk-na-Amure asks whether our plans, those of the center, do in fact envision the involvement of Eastern and Western countries in the mastery of the Far East, and in the development of its forces of production—in particular the involvement of the United States, Canada, Korea, and Japan?

I believe that this process has already begun, although it is still at the exploratory stage, so to speak. It seems to me that some interesting joint work awaits us there. But we must be careful. We cannot operate in such a way that it does some kind of harm to us, either nationally or economically.

[Lukyanov interjects] I think that that is enough questions, comrades, or do you have some more?

[Gorbachev, picking up a pile of papers] There are still quite a lot left.

[Lukyanov] Well, please go ahead.

[Gorbachev] Let us agree that no more will be submitted, alright?

[Lukyanov] Yes, the last...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] I will answer these, I will try to do so quickly.

[Lukyanov, as someone hands him another question] That is the last question, Mikhail Sergeyevich. That is it. No more questions, please.

[Gorbachev] Will the agreements that have been signed in the United States be proposed for ratification by the USSR, and when—in particular the agreement with the Chevron firm on mastering the Tengiz deposit? I will have to sort out whether we do submit decisions and agreements of this kind for ratification: or perhaps it is within the framework of the committees, so that the committee is aware, so to speak. This will have to be sorted out.

Well, [Gorbachev laughs] I welcome this as a person who has respect for humor! Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, was not the idea of exchanging presidents for a short time expressed at the meeting with Bush? [general laughter] Would you not like to take the helm in the United States? This is a double hint, there is a hidden implication that perhaps Bush will help us to do something here. Alright, I will think about why this question was asked by Deputy Belousov. [laughter]

Did I not mention it? The question here is for the figure regarding grain: 8-14 is the figure— million tonnes, that is.

Two questions: How will military expenditures be reduced in the event that individual member-countries in East Europe leave the Warsaw Pact organization? How will military expenditures be increased, or will they be reduced in the event of individual member-countries in East Europe leaving?

I think that we will pursue our plans. I am aware of something different. That in the case of the cessation of the activity of blocs or the secession of some state from the bloc, then some consider that their national army should be greater. But today this has all been borne by us.

Is a process analogous to the conversion of military production taking place in the United States? If so, then what difficulties are they experiencing?

The very same ones, comrades, and therefore the military industrial complex is fighting very strongly against reducing production.

The Lithuania factor in the trade agreement?

As you point out, in all the President's speeches, ratification of the trade agreement is tied to our law on emigration [from the USSR].

Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, is a nuclear-free world a reality or myth? Is it nevertheless necessary to support nuclear weapons at some level as a deterrent factor?

Your point of view coincides with Mrs. Thatcher's point of view and, since you are from Kiev, I think that her statements have exerted some influence on you! I have been holding discussions with her since 1983-84, and so far her point of view has not exerted any influence on me. On the contrary, on 15 January 1986 we arrived at the announcement of our program for a nonviolent nuclear-free world.

You know what? When we made this statement in January 1986 the first responses were that these were illusions. The international affairs specialists will recall at once; that is how it was. Comrade Burlatskiy or Velikhov will confirm this, incidentally. Well, the illusion is now such that we have now come as far as the signing of a treaty on a 50 percent cut. So let us follow this path on which we have embarked. I believe that since Chernobyl we have been even more convinced that we must follow this path. Well, imagine! One block at one station, one emission, and such an enormous country as ours has still not coped with it. And how many new things keep opening up for us? Fourteen billion rubles have been spent on this. So this is madness, and any war, the most localized, as it were—it cannot be localized. So this is nevertheless a great political aim—we must pursue it.

Comrade Petrushenko... I could not even hear Comrade Petrushenko and I cannot see where you are sitting. Ah... I could not hear that... that the president... the Nevada movement, in an interview with NEDELYA, substantiated the need and the expediency of unilateral nuclear disarmament. What would President Bush and President Gorbachev say about this? Well, I do not know about President Bush, but I am sure that he would be against it so long as... [changes thought] You see, we are proposing all the time that we cease nuclear tests. All the time. It does not happen. It does not happen.

But I think that as far as the expediency of unilateral nuclear disarmament is concerned, I think we are generally on the right road and moving together. And you know, this makes a lot of things much clearer. We know that control and cooperation are being established, the second stage of confidence. Let us continue on in the same way.

Where it was necessary, we embarked on unilateral steps, you know, where we obviously had surpluses, so to speak. But in principle I do not think...[changes thought] Sometimes there is a need to embark on a unilateral step in order to stimulate things, so to speak. This is all maneuvering, it is politics, it is strategy and tactics, and here, so to speak, everything has to be considered. Sometimes not everyone understands why we suddenly embarked on this step. I do not rule out unilateral steps, but if we are to speak about nuclear disarmament, I think we are on the right path. We have given up nuclear missiles by 50 percent. Now Mr. Bush has recognized this idea on tactical nuclear weapons. They have abandoned modernization, and are ready to start talks. And probably after signing—as we agreed conditionally—in Vienna this year on the first agreement on the results of the talks, we shall start talks on tactical nuclear weapons. So everything has been covered, so to speak.

Comrade Kerimov asks whether the question of further development and the strengthening of international cooperation to protect human rights was discussed. I understand that the commission is encouraging Comrade Kerimov to ask this. In general the question of human rights is always present in all summit talks between the presidents of our countries.

Comrade Peters asks whether the question of turning the Baltic republics into a nuclear-free zone, or even better, a demilitarized one, was discussed. It was not discussed on such a specific level, Comrade Peters.

A long question, a whole page. Comrade Tsybukh asks on behalf of his committee: Was the question discussed between the presidents about links between our young

people and the stepping up of these links? They were not only discussed—I have told you that they have been expanded among students, and in general, if you noticed, this is my position: What I found in Stanford University, comrades—I had to get out of my car, and practically all of the 10,000—of course, I did not count them—students walked for a kilometer or a kilometer and a half. All the students came out and off we went. I have never met such a reaction from a student body in my life. Never, anywhere. Everyone who was at Stanford with me knows what happened there. The young people were very well disposed. They were relaxed, you know, expressed their thoughts directly, asked questions and were very sympathetic to what we are doing. For this reason I think it is precisely among young people that contacts should be developed so as...It is easier for them, they have fewer complexes than we do, so it is easier for them to establish relations, as it were, and to continue with them. I think we should take up the same position. I have already answered this one.

Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, the United States is making many serious accords dependent on events in the Baltic. What are your immediate plans with regard to these republics? I think they are the same as your own plans. I hope they are not at variance. If they are, that will not do. First of all, the United States is not making all the relations already formed between us, which are gaining momentum, dependent on this problem, although they are showing a lively interest in it. That is the first thing. So, your statement that things are being made dependent on events in the Baltic is, no doubt, an exaggeration.

What are the immediate plans? I think that you and I, the president, the government and the Supreme Soviet, have a single, common mandate: the third Congress of USSR People's Deputies which recognized the decisions of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet as invalid and illegal. That is the first thing. Then, as is well-known—and here I am looking at Comrade Soblchak as a co-party to that resolution—true, the interview, they say, should be seen. He has already forgotten that he is a party to that resolution. I will remind him of it now. We do have this weakness, of forgetting who said what the day before yesterday or particularly (?two weeks ago). To be precise, we wrote at the same time: we recognize and endorse in this document the constitutional right to self-determination, and the president is instructed to do everything to defend the constitutional system, protect citizens' constitutional rights, and create conditions to provide an opportunity to realize the right to self-determination in constitutional forms—provided the people back it. [an indistinct comment from the hall is heard] Can the president actually do anything or not?

In the first place, there is no blockade. No. And so, you and I... for the first time, comrades, I will be frank with you and say... [loud laughter] For the first time I will tell you frankly that I intend to make a broad...You have not heard this before! That's what I meant. Or do you think that I am not frank with you as a rule?! [more laughter] No! I believe you know me by now. I intend to place a broad interpretation on this. The congress has lifted it, deemed it illegal and demanded that it be lifted. And so it seems that that is all there is to it. What? [interjection by unidentified deputy: "It should be lifted."]

Yes, lifted. I believe that, if the Lithuanian Republic suspends these acts on state independence, then we can start talking. For if they stop—if only for a period of negotiations—that would mean the situation would return to what it was on 10 March. I hope this will be understood by society, because I am receiving many telegrams about how strong the Baltic republics' leaders are and how weak our president is. By weak what is meant is that the president has not yet deployed what he has at his disposal. Nevertheless, I believe we are on the right road to seeking political solutions.

Comrades, this is hard, very hard. But the main thing is that our choice must lie here. This does not mean, though, that life cannot make us opt for others... It could force us to opt for other measures. And our friends, all my friends whom I now know by name in the Baltics should know this. If life requires it, then that is life. And we will do it, everything that is necessary, in line with the Constitution, in line with the Constitution. And so, if—I think some talks have begun over there...I can hear a familiar voice making some objection...No, comrade Kogan [from Estonia]. [objections heard from the hall]

Well, unfortunately, that is what I have to listen to. Well, comrades, for as long as you and the country put up with this president, I will shoulder the responsibility. I hear everything, including your views. You and I have spoken. I hear all the opinions and views. But you know, if I were the sort of person who, at the first sign of trouble, would dive for cover and run...with the fundamental changes that are taking place in the country, when the whole political system is changing, when we are embarking on a new economical model, too, when we are embarking on a new federation—for the state will be unable to survive if it does not resolve these questions. Essentially then, new and different forms of life are taking shape. And the result is that we are moving toward a qualitatively new society. This would not come about. Nobody could persuade me—again there is all kinds of talk that someone holds some sort of secret talisman in his hand. He promises that all we have to do is move to a market economy and everything will be splendid. Brekhnya! [that is a lie!] I apologize for borrowing this word from the Ukrainians, though I am speaking Russian. We must do all we can to minimize the difficulties and pain, especially for low income people on a fixed income. We must do everything we can to safeguard the standard of living. But to say that it will be painless and easy is totally meaningless. It indicates a lack of understanding, and the main thing is that society and the people are being encumbered with this lack of understanding.

Well anyway, that comrade Kogan has got me going. He is forever inciting me to revolutionary actions... [general

laughter] I believe, comrades, that we must find an answer along political lines, and that it can already be clearly discerned, clearly discerned. I believe that if all our friends from the Baltics think things over, the formula for suspending the decisions taken—if only for the duration of the talks and discussions... Tomorrow, no today we are to have a meeting of the Federation Council, and we will start discussing all these vital matters—how to build and reform our federation. Let us do everything there. Let us do everything.

At the present time, in my view, very fine prerequisites have been created so that we might really breathe new life into our union of sovereign states, while preserving all of the advantages, and what we can gain—the benefits—from this cooperation. I think that it is on this path that we will, after all, find an answer.

I hope, comrades, that you are taking an understanding attitude—let us not get nervous. I would not want our relations to be spoiled even in the Supreme Soviet, and in the country, with the Baltic republics, and with the peoples of the Baltics. And, of course, I do not want them to be spoiled in such a way that all people of other nationalities who live there, that living conditions should become intolerable for them as a result of this. This is out. The Balts cannot escape it, and we cannot escape it; we have lived for centuries and we have to cooperate. We must find the correct answers, the correct answers, and not go out of our minds or go berserk.

The comrades from Murmansk have asked another question—I am talking about Semipalatinsk, and I am saying that measures are being taken concerning reduction, reliability, but—they say—the load is going to Novaya Zemlya. Well, in general we have always considered this problem together. Comrade Suleymenov has said that something should be read out without fail. Well, he has a way with words and always writes in such a convincing and clear manner, but for all that, the idea comes down to closing it. Is that not so, Comrade Suleymenov? Is it about closing it? [Unidentified speaker says: "Yes, of course, about closing it."]

Well, generally speaking, I am, in principle, a supporter of yours. [indistinct intervention from the floor] Like everyone. I understand. About closing it. But we need to weigh everything up here, as it were. We are talking about our common destiny, after all. There cannot be an ill-considered decision here. We will continue, Comrade Suleymenov, we will continue so that everyone living in Kazakhstan will understand us, just as in the north, that the whole thing is so that it can be closed, right up to a closure, but this situation must be arrived at. [murmurs from hall] No, to arrive at this situation, at a closure. (Comrade Prikhotka) from Transcarpathia says that the construction of a radar station has become an acute issue, and asks whether halting the construction of this station has been discussed. Well, I do not know. Vladimir Antonovich should tell you about this. We had a conversation about this radar station once, about the state of this propblem. [indistinct voices from hall] Vladimir Antonovich and his comrades will find out about this, I think. Because you are saying that we should expand upon these stations, it means, evidently, that some questions have arisen regarding this station. We will find out. Thank you for your attention, comrades. [applause]

Gorbachev Speaks to Supreme Soviet 12 Jun

LD1206091390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0605 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Address by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev at USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin—live]

[Text] Esteemed Deputies, I consider it necessary to inform you of the results of the USSR president's state visit to Canada and the United States of America, as this concerns an important international event, and it is has vital significance for our internal affairs as well.

The first thing to which I would like to draw your attention is the temporal aspect of the summit. It so happened that two key processes of world significance convened there. First, this is the onset of the fundamental transformations here—moreover, on a scale comparable to the revolution of 1917, which makes it more obvious that today the central point of world politics is perestroyka in the Soviet Union.

Second, one can say, is the unfavorable state of cardinal changes in the European continent. So at the meeting of these two processes, it was necessary to assign a place and role to the two most powerful states and reveal their capability, when acting together, to make their contribution in preparing a long, irreversible, peaceful development of civilization.

It depended on how the summit went whether Soviet-U.S. relations would exert a stablizing influence at the present most responsible time, when the powerful processes of changes open up before many peoples great prospects, but at the same time are fraught with dangerous shocks.

We went to the United States with Malta and the ensuing intensive contacts and cooperation on various levels behind us.

This allowed Soviet-U.S. relations, which have gone through very serious tests in connection with events in our country, and the stormy processes which have developed since autumn last year in East Europe [as heard]. They survived these tests on the whole. The breakthrough to new Soviet-U.S. relations achieved on Malta was timely. The leadership of both states acted on that level of high responsibility of which history had laid on them in that transitional period of history, demanding from both the observance of the principles of equality, freedom of choice, and balance of interests.

Upon departure for the United States, we wanted to establish our positions on fundamental questions. First, to what degree does the policy of the United States give

priority to the main, positive trend which has arisen recently and which is linked with the growing integrity of the world and the new type of progress in conditions of global dangers threatening mankind?

Secondly, to what degree is policy influenced by orientation towards short-term gains or the obtaining of benefits by taking advantage of the other side's difficulties, and of complications of a transient nature in the international arena?

Thirdly, is there the understanding that the USSR and the United States in a situation of acute changes in the world can no longer allow themselves to act against each other? And that with their policies they should not even give grounds for suspicion that they want to beat you, overtake you, or materially or morally damage you?

Fourthly, to what degree are both superpowers, taking into account the unavoidable link of practical politics with the legacy of the past—it is dangerous not to take this into account—prepared to use new methods for conducting international affairs? Specifically, to reject the use of force and the preference for the military component rather than the political, and to saturate politics with norms of law and morality.

Fifthly, is there the understanding and readiness to take into account through policies the fact that mankind is entering into a new age, and that some kind of other, as yet unaccustomed normalities and rules, are beginning to act throughout the whole world? And that as a result sometimes non-standard solutions and the overcoming of inertia and the old thinking are necessary?

For all these reasons the key question of our dialogue, not only with the President, but also with other representatives of American society and state, was the following: What kind of Soviet Union does the United States want to see, and what kind of United States do we, the USSR, want to see?

Whether the two powerful states and the two great peoples will be able to be together at this turning point in the life of world society depended, and will depend, on the answer to this question. What together means is a secondary question. It is a question of practical action in everyday politics. I think our visit has given, on the whole, a satisfactory answer to this cardinal—philosophical if you like—question, and therefore to the questions mentioned earlier. I suppose our appraisal here does not differ greatly from the U.S. appraisal.

In this connection it is very important the U.S. Administration, and first and foremost the President himself, Mr. Bush, under great pressure from various sides, is able to maintain, on the whole, a balanced, responsible approach to the most profound, revolutionary changes in the Soviet Union. We saw that not only in the top political echelon of the United States, but also in influential business and academic circles and in the broad masses of the population, that there is the understanding that a new Soviet Union corresponds to the interests of their country, a Soviet Union that opens itself up to man, proceeds along the path of democraticization, decentralization, glasnost, and the development of freedom in all spheres of life, and that offers a policy of improving relations, disarmament, and cooperation to the outside world.

If it is thus, then there exists the decisive condition for cooperation in world politics and restructuring international relations on new principles. We told the Americans, although in various ways, depending on the audience: we do not have pretensions as to teaching the United States how to live. We would like them to change as well, adapting to the demands of the peaceful period of history that is emerging.

From the conceptual and political point of view, the revelation and confirmation of such a likeness in the main aspects is now of the greatest importance and in general determines everything else, outweighs everything else, including the choice of the way and the methods for realizing this mutual interest to the advantage of our two peoples, and the entire rest of the world.

They generally are expressed in the formula: from confrontation and rivalry to mutual understanding, cooperation, and partnership. We evidently have gone along the greater part of the path of this formula in recent years, and evidently we now are somewhere at the beginning of cooperation, although there already are elements of partnership as well.

This tendency can be clearly seen. It is confirmed by the desire manifested during the course of the visit to conduct affairs on an equal footing, as great powers bearing a special responsibility towards the world and endowed with the capabilities to realize this responsibility they bear.

Despite all the speculations and gloomy forecasts by certain self-styled Cassandras, these were frank, substantive, and equal negotiations. Countermoves also were needed, certain steps towards one another. All this to a great degree ensured the meeting's success and considerably augmented the capital of trust which began accumulating intensively after Malta.

Permit me now to brief you on how things stood on the main points of the negotiations. Regarding the problem of reducing nuclear and conventional weapons, the agreements reached in Washington are the result of four years of Soviet and American efforts in this direction. Coordination of the main provisions of the future treaty on reducing strategic offensive weapons by 50 percent, which was begun even before Reykjavik, was completed. Important problems also were resolved relating to the numbers of, and limiting the deployment of air-based cruise missiles on heavy bombers and sea-based cruise missiles. Right up until the last minute, right up until the very date of the visit, one may say, these were a subject of disagreement. Now a real opportunity has been created for completing preparation and signing of this treaty this very year.

So as a result, may we be confident the forthcoming reductions of the USSR's and United States' strategic weapons are of equal value? Undoubtedly so. Does the future treaty ensure parity in the numbers of strategic delivery vehicles and nuclear weapons on them? Each side has the right to deploy 1,600 delivery vehicles of strategic nuclear weapons, including heavy missiles, on submarines and heavy bombers, and 6,000 nuclear weapons on them. This treaty does not encompass sea-based cruise missiles: limits are placed on these in a separate document, a supplement to the treaty. We posed the question in this way from the very start, for in our opinion—and this in the end was recognized by the U.S. side—if we reduce only strategic offensive weapons, but leave beyond our purview sea-based cruise missiles, then the Americans—by virtue of the highly-developed naval fleet at their disposal, and which is continually growing—could rapidly forge ahead and destroy the balance which can be attained at a lower level following a 50 percent cut.

In addition to the 6,000 weapons, the USSR and the United States each possess the right to deploy 880 such missiles on submarines and surface ships of certain types. That is, a level is established and fixed, which is something which had not been possible to reach at all throughout the negotiations. Now this is done. Besides this, according to the rules for counting air-based cruise missiles on heavy bombers, the United States has the opportunity to deploy roughly 800-900 more of such missiles than the Soviet Union. However, we, according to the same rule for counting, many deploy, if we desire, 40 percent more bombers of this type. For instance, the United States could have 150 and the Soviet Union could have 210.

Thus, the United States may deploy roughly 8,300, and the Soviet Union may deploy 7,400 weapons belonging to all types of strategic- nuclear-nuclear weapons. To the uninitiated, this looks like a concession. However, the launching of air-based cruise missiles will be fixed at 600 km and over according to the treaty. The scrap, so to speak, over this lasted four years. The United States has made a compromise here. At first, it insisted on 1,500 km, then 800 km. In toto, the complex parameters of the future treaty have been painstakingly adjusted and are a coordinated balance of concessions and interests.

All of this has to be examined in detail in the Supreme Soviet committees, especially during preparation of the treaty for ratification.

The issue of non-circumvention of the treaty has given rise to serious disagreements and continues to remain unresolved. Referring to special relations with Great Britain in the strategic weapons field, the Americans are insisting on their right to pass on both technology and any types of strategic weapons, without any restrictions. By this token a channel is preserved for evading the treaty, for carrying on improvement and even augmenting strategic nuclear arsenals within the framework of the general NATO strategy. These issues still have to be tackled in a serious manner.

It should be said, and it is worth recalling, that when talks were being held in Reykjavik—and then it was a question of the reduction of medium-range missiles and of the idea of working out and signing a treaty on a 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons—we then made the concession of, for the time being, at this stage, leaving the French and Britain nuclear forces out of consideration.

But after this, we, the U.S., and also the French and British, made statements that they would join in the process of negotiations on reducing nuclear strategic offensive armaments after the Soviet Union and the United States had made 50 percent reductions. Now that we have set down the main provisions and are reaching a stage where this treaty can be signed by the end of the year, the question naturally arises, and we mentioned this both in Washington and also now in our conversation with Mrs. Thatcher. Of course such a formula without restrictions is unacceptable for us, in the sense of modernizing submarines, nuclear weapons on submarines. The talk always has been of replacing Trident I's with Trident II's—and only that. Here they now want to put forward a general formula which would make it possible and which would open up a channel for getting around this. Once again this is impermissible and unacceptable.

A very important agreement was signed in Washington on an 80 percent reduction in chemical armaments, with the subsequent attainment of an accord on completely destroying them. For a long time the Americans were unwilling for the issue to be put that way, protecting their right to the production of binary chemical weapons. It is especially important they have moved to meet us on this matter, too. Moreover, the agreement opens up the way to signing a multilateral convention on chemical weapons, preparations for which have been marking time for many years.

Protocols have been adopted to treaties limiting underground tests of nuclear weapons and underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. The ratification of treaties signed as long ago as the mid-70's thereby becomes possible: 1974-1976, if anyone remembers and was interested in this. This is a step along the road towards a goal we will never give up—the complete banning of nuclear tests.

An accord has been reached on measures against the proliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons, of combat missiles capable of carrying such weapons and of related technologies. This of itself is very important. If we are only going to agree on reducing and destroying, and if the process of acquisition of missile technology and nuclear weapons is to go on all around us, then once again a situation is created which will require, as it were, everything to be started from the beginning. But it is to

be borne in mind that at least 13 states already possess the ability to have nuclear weapons. At least, that is our estimation.

The question of reducing armed forces in Europe was specifically examined. It was noted at the meeting with President Bush that a lot had been done at the negotiations on this question. The prerequisites have been created for the treaty to be ready for signing at an all-European summit by the end of the year. The recent agreement of the U.S. Administration and the NATO countries to start talks overall on tactical nuclear weapons and giving up the modernization of these is certainly a positive step. The NATO position on the problem of reducing air forces is a complicating factor.

They are insisting on inclusion of land-based naval aircraft in the Vienna talks, while it would be proper to consider this question at future talks on the reduction of naval forces as a whole. Our naval aircraft are based on land, whereas in the United States they are based on ships. Thus it turns out we are putting off talks on naval forces, but ours are going to be put into the equation. This is naturally unacceptable.

One also has to bear in mind the United States' position on including a united Germany in NATO, something that could substantially alter the balance and distort the existing security structure. In this event, we would be forced to reconsider anew much of what constitutes the subject of the Vienna talks, inasmuch as the continent's whole strategic situation would change.

At the talks on reducing nuclear and conventional weapons, problems relating to the fundamental interests of the country's defense capability are being examined and solved. For this reason the talks themselves and the preparation of directives for them are being conducted by a large collective of qualified specialists from the Ministry of Defense, primarily the General Staff, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the USSR Council of Minister's Military Industrial Commission and other departments.

Collectives of scientists from the USSR Academy of Sciences and other research establishments are systematically brought in. The directives for the talks are developed through research and business-like discussions. Of course, various opinions and arguments arise during this, which in the final instance are reduced to a single denominator.

On the whole I consider that in Washington major results in reducing nuclear and conventional weapons were achieved, and groundwork has been created for the future, by defining principles on which talks will be conducted in the coming years. All this has immense significance. Yet one more practical step has been taken in implementing the ideas of a nonviolent, non-nuclear world.

There still is much difficult work ahead in this direction. But dismantling has begun of the grandiose monument of the cold war, which has stood before the present generation of people: the potential for mutual destruction. I already have said that even taking apart such a monument is not a simple matter, and is even not without dangers. For this reason it is necessary to act without haste, attentively and painstakingly adjusting the balance at every new stage of the movement towards the goal. Here even the tiniest distortion can have destructive consequences for the whole work that has begun.

It is necessary to say that we have agreed and signed an agreement on the destruction of 80 percent of chemical weapons. Now the task of technology will stand before us—how can this be done? It turns out this is not simpler but more difficult than to produce them. There was an exchange of views with the President on this matter, with a view to exchanging technologies for destroying chemical weapons.

The Soviet Union and the United States bear their share of responsibility for the fact the postwar period was one of exhausting and dangerous confrontation, which drained resources and deformed not only the economy, but also social development as a whole. It is unprecedented and important these same countries also have taken on the responsibility for dismantling the mechanisms of East-West military confrontation as a whole, as soon as possible, so the opportunity will arise for using disarmament to free resources for tackling social problems and for improving people's lives. If the world has changed in the last few years and has advanced in the direction of a truly peaceful period, then a decisive contribution to this belongs to the USSR and the United States of America.

Now to European problems. Europe today is experiencing a turning point in its history, and so all European problems were the focus of very lengthy and intensive talks throughout the visit and, as they say, at any time, no matter where the two Presidents were. The Soviet Union is an organic part of Europe, and the turbulent changes which today have encompassed its eastern part in particular, are a direct result of perestroyka and the renewal of our country. But there also is a reverse dependence. The pace and nature of the whole Soviet people's attainment of a new quality of life will depend much on how a transformed Europe turns out for us. This is why our European policy has vital significance for perestroyka's success. Perhaps for the first time a chance is opening up for the continent's states and peoples to live together in stable peace, on the principles of humanism and voluntary consent and considering genuine national interests. This is a chance for a transition from age-old alientation to recognized interconnecton, and to organic interaction and codevelopment, and we must, naturally, not miss this chance.

I believe Israel must heed the combined and persistent advice of the two presidents and act sensibly.

During our discussion of the Afghan problem, which proceeded in a totally different tone from before, there was a clear indication that the two sides have no interest in accerbating the conflict. One might count among the results the intention to help put a stop to the internal war, with, of course, respect for the national dignity, rights and interests of the entire Afghan people.

There was virtually no disagreement on southern Africa. The joint contribution to the start of the settlement of the Namibian problem was noted with satisfaction. We will develop contacts with all forces that are taking part in the search for a just solution to this region's most complicated problems.

Though there were certain differences in emphasis, a readiness was voiced to facilitate normalization on the Korean peninsula and in Cambodia, the establishment of peaceful relations, and the settlement of disputes.

The joint declaration on Ethiopia: for the first time joint humanitarian actions are being undertaken which, it is hoped, will help restore peace to this country, ravaged by famine and civil war.

Generally, then, on this range of questions—regional problems—one can say we really have covered the path from rivalry to mutual understanding, and now even to mutual action. This is in the interests of our people and serves to improve international relations in general.

Now for bilateral relations. That is a rather conventional title. It is accepted in diplomatic practice, although in this case it does not reflect the actual significance of this direction in our politics, since we are talking about relations between world powers. That which was achieved in this field also testifies to the success of the summit. In our opinion, there was a notable step towards narrowing the gap between our country and world economy. For, as everyone knows, the United States is its most powerful and influential component. A whole parcel of economic, scientific, technological, and other agreements and protocols was signed. They have been enumerated in the press, and they are all extraordinarily advantageous to the Soviet Union, not least in a quite literal material sense.

The very nature of such a bulky package is quite without precedent. I would like to mention in particular the trade agreement. It was no easy matter to reach it. Right up to the very last moment it was uncertain whether the Americans would agree to sign it. Nevertheless, President Bush did so, and even suggested it should be signed by the presidents themselves. I rate this fact very highly, for at the present time the economic aspect is irrelevant. In practical terms it will be some time before we can make use of the benefits this agreement offers. The main point lies in the political significance of the document at this acute, crucial stage of perestroyka in the Soviet Union. Thus, the U.S. leadership really does have confidence in us. Here we have the start of a shift from verbal support for perestroyka, and statements wishing us well, to action.

The U.S. President has made a courageous, principled choice. He has given precedence to the main issue in world politics, and has not given way to the opportunist, temporary considerations to which many were urging him, and, indeed, continue to urge—you already know this—even after the conclusion of the visit.

On the eve of the visit opponents of a trade agreement vociferously made themselves felt in the U.S. press and in Congress, to the effect the United States supposedly should not make the Soviet Union economic presents until it adopts a law on freedom of emigration and until Moscow grants full freedom of action to Lithuanian separatists.

But, on direct contact with U.S. society, in the course of the visit it transpired such voices in no way reflect the position of all of the United States. During the visit I met very many representatives of U.S. business, academia, and intellectuals. Among them were eminent and celebrated figures, people of immense influence, both in world economics and in U.S. politics.

I can say, without falling into illusions, that not only the great interest, but also the practical commitment of this extremely authoritative section of U.S. society to the development of relations with us is quite obvious. They are sincerely searching for a way to specific cooperation with us in a businesslike manner. This is a very substantial point, and also bears witness to a breakthrough in U.S. society with regard to us and the growing confidence the contemporary Soviet Union is giving rise to in the West. You know the U.S. has made signing the trade agreement conditional on adoption of the law on exits and entries in the USSR Supreme Soviet. This law has passed the first reading here, and it will be adopted, but by no means as some kind of concession of principle; rather, as the natural expression of the policy of perestroyka, and, it goes without saying, considering the interests of citizens and state security.

The trade agreement on a reciprocal basis constitutes an unconditional most-favored nation status for three years, with automatic extension for the following three-year term. More favorable conditions for the cooperation of U.S. firms and Soviet organizations are provided for, in particular, the direct hiring of personnel and advertising via all the mass media and the post, direct contacts between partners, marketing on the territory of the other country.

In the agreement there is a section on protection of the rights to intellectual ownership, including protections of computer programs, trade secrets, audio recordings, and so forth. We have assumed the obligation of developing and putting forward draft laws on issues which so far are not regulated by our laws to the USSR Supreme Soviet in the course of 1990 and 1991.

The agreement creates legal opportunities for the U.S. to remove all restrictions on financial guarantees and granting credit, both at the state and private level. Reciprocal financial claims will be regulated. In this way

this important sphere of our economic relations will be freed from unresolved problems of a legal nature. A green light will be given to extensive cooperation in the field of credit.

A new five-year agreement from 1 January 1990 has been concluded on grain supplies. It will enable us to make more flexible use of volumes and ranges of purchases of grain from the United States. Commerical interests will be better protected, since state subsidy of supplies is provided for and the obligations on the quality of the grain have been more clearly defined.

The agreement on aerial communication provides for the significant expansion of the geography and frequency of flights. the number of flights from each side may rise from 30 to 84 per week. Up to 500,000 passengers from each country will be transported annually. The number is now 130,000.

Aeroflot will be given the opportunity to run additional flights to Chicago, San Francisco, Miami, and Anchorage, and U.S. companies will be given the opportunity to run additional flights to Kiev, Minsk, Tbilisi, Riga, Khabarovsk, and Magadan. In addition, each side will possess the right to 100 annual charter flights.

As a result of all this, we will make a considerable profit, some of which will be in hard currency. The agreement on maritime shipping considerably improves the conditions of work of the Soviet commercial fleet on lines between the USSR and U.S. and creates favorable procedures for ships' access to the partner's ports. The right has been restored for Soviet ships to carry U.S. goods to third countries. A particular feature of the agreement is the encouraging approach to contacts between shipping enterprises and cooperation in all areas of shipping.

A memorandum was signed on mutual understanding on the U.S.-USSR culture, science, and education project. Its aim is the extensive computerization of education, the training of Soviet specialists and the preservation of cultural values. In the initial stage, the IBM Corporation will, within the framework of the project, deliver more than 13,000 personal computers for schools, to teach the handicapped and children with hearing and sight defects, as well as to train managers. The project, designed for 10-15 years, will enable us to embark upon working out the financial and technical aspects of organizing the manufacture of personal computers within the USSR.

The agreement on expanding cooperation between a Soviet foreign economic consortium of 22 enterprises and U.S. trading consortium which includes major firms with many thousands of millions in capital, stipulates the creation of 20-25 joint enterprises to produce consumer goods, cars, and medical equipment, modernization of the food, medical, machine-building and oil industries, promotion of regional development and the social and economic programs of the Kazakh SSR. A protocol of intent between the USSR Ministry of the Oil and Gas Industry, the Council of Ministers of the Kazakh SSR, the (Tengizneftegaz Production Association) and the Chevron firm determines the procedure for including the Tengiz oil field in the joint enterprise (?Sovshevron) at the Korolevskoye oil field.

This can be seen as a real breakthrough in economic relations between the two countries and signifies thousands of millions of capital investments in the oil refining complex and the latest technology ensuring ecological safety.

The U.S. Government timed the adoption of a number of decisions to lift existing restrictions on trade with the USSR to coincide with the summit. A proposal was submitted to liberalize the lists of the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls.

Export of Soviet nickel to the U.S. has been permitted, as have sales of the Control Data firm's computers to ensure the safety of nuclear power generation. The deal with this major Minneapolis firm, which we visited, constituted the first breakthrough in the area of trading in goods on which export to the USSR had been banned. True, on 6 June, the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress voted to freeze deliveries to the USSR of highly complex technology, linking this to Lithuania. I think, however, that it is a matter of time. We have much dissatisfaction with demands for telephone communications. Talks with the U.S. company, U.S. West, are in progress on a plan for a fiber optics communications line across the whole territory of Siberia—but here too, for the moment, there is something of a standstill. In addition to meeting civilian demands, it would close a global communications ring and provide first class services to the Pacific Ocean region and Europe.

In conversations with the President of the United States the issue of the great possibilities of scientific and technical cooperation in the field of peaceful atomic energy was also discussed. We signed a joint statement on an international thermo- nuclear experimental reactor and, in addition, an agreement on cooperation in world maritime research. A joint statement was made on setting up a Soviet-U.S. international park in the Bering Sea region. The agreement on expanding student exchanges received a considerable response in the United States. Each year our countries will exchange students by the thousand, rather than in small groups. Soviet students, I should think, will derive much useful knowledge not only in his own specific field but, in general, especially in the field of organizing the academic processes, labor, production, enterprise, and daily life, as well. There is something we can learn in the United States in this respect. The mass exchange of students is an important channel for better mutual understanding and a matter with political implications.

Conversion promises great prospects in the sense of deepening Soviet-U.S. economic cooperation. Bearing in mind the high standard of the technology of military industries, it opens up such areas as electronics and computer technology, space research, and many related

areas for cooperation. U.S. business and scientific circles, especially on the west coast, in San Francisco and Stanford, drew attention to a proposal on the joint development of the natural bases of Siberia and the Far East, and inquired about the idea of free enterprise zones in the region of Nakhodka. In short, what is called bilateral relations, and what was achieved in this area as a result of the summit meeting expands the opportunities for practical involvement of the Soviet Union in the system of the world market and the international division of labor.

But there is yet another significant aspect of all this. I am talking about the material foundation of Soviet-U.S. relations and their further progress. Everyone is well aware today that without intensive and many-sided economic ties and broad cooperation in the field of science and technology, it is unlikely one can count on the dynamism and stability of these relations meeting the demands of the time. It is very important the business world of the United States, aware of this, and also the fact this meets its longterm interests, is meeting us halfway, showing a kind of solidarity with our work to revitalize the country, and is willing to come to our assistance, especially in the decisive stage of perstroyka, so this difficult transition should be less painful for our people.

The success of the summit was the result not only of the new character of the dialogue between the presidents in general on the political level, and not only of the official negotiations for which, speaking for our part, great merit belongs to Comrades Shevardnadze and Bessmertnykh, the present ambassador in the United States. Many comrades contributed to the final success, undoubtedly those who conducted work directly within the framework of the visit. Among them I would like to name Comrade Maslyukov and a large group of people's deputies; Primakov, Osipyan, Akhromeyev, Velikhov, Falin, Arbatov, Golik, Yefremov, Likhachev, Shatalin, Lyudmila Arutyunyan, Bikhodzhal Rakhimova, Kruchina, Ryzhkov, Dsasokhov, Minister Yagodin, and chairman of the chamber of trade (Malkevich). Others, whom I will not name here, including journalists and public figures, whose harmonious work was coordinated by Comrade Grachev, also deserve thanks.

You could see on television how we were received in the United States. We fully sense the interest, affection and even solidarity with which people are following what we are doing today. Some as a result of serious analysis, some thanks to common sense, and some simply from a feeling of participation in what is going on in the modern world and alarm for its future. But an immense mass of people in the United States perceive perestroyka in the Soviet Union as a great historic issue which affects everyone. I am even profoundly convinced that if there were not this mood in U.S. society, then President Bush would hardly have accepted these agreements, because the forces which oppose this are not insignificant. It is very important that perestroyka, which now and then proceeds with extreme difficulty, and is accompanied by great worries and disorders, meets with such broad understanding and ubiquitous support in the world. The world is changing before our eyes, sometimes changes unexpectedly, and breaks the prejudices and stereotpyes on which the mass psychology and politics of yesterday were based. This strengthens our certainty that we are on the right track and that our policy of New Thinking, bridge-building and the unification of all who want the construction of a modern, safe world is finding a response even where quite recently there was a continuous sea of animosity and distrust. Our peoples are becoming even friendlier. All this confirms the reality of our course of incorporating the country in the mainstream of civilization. What has been said also applies to the visit to Canada. Despite all the importance of the Soviet-U.S. summit, it should not conceal this visit. Soviet-Canadian relations also have independent significance. The trip to Canada and its results are one more important step in the development of, one may say, friendly relations with this major country which, in a certain sense, is our extremely extensive neighbor in terms of area.

We have many points of contact in bilateral relations—economic, cultural and geographical ones—and all of them were discussed in a very amicable, promising spirit. The present scales and continuity of our economic cooperation with Canada and the presence here of a good contractual and legal foundation enable us to rely on new dynamism in connection with economic reform. Canadian business circles are definitely disposed to this.

Hopes are placed on the efficient operation of the Canadian- Soviet business council, founded in November of last year in Moscow, on the realization of the agreement which provides for incentives for the reciprocal protection of capital investment.

During the visit, issues of trade in foodstuffs, and Canada's participation in the execution of major economic projects, in particular, in connection with the reconstruction of Leningrad, were discussed. There is agreement that the setting up of joint enterprises can impart substantial impetus to business cooperation as a whole.

As far as negotiations with Prime Minister Mulroney himself—who gives the impression of a serious and thorough statesman—are concerned, they were basically devoted to the German problem, and via this to the role of Canada in the European process. Mulroney's position basically does not differ from the U.S. one. Therefore, my argumentation was also the same as later in the negotiations with Bush, about which I have already talked.

As a whole, the visit to Canada is, I think, also useful for improving the general atmosphere in the European process. In conclusion, I would like to repeat what I was already saying in the United States. I do not doubt that this Washington summit will go down in history as a summit of hope and optimism.

Generally, then, this was a major international event. We now know the world's reactions to it—authoritative quarters, including the participants in the meeting of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, rate it very highly. Incidentally, on the subject of that Political Consultative Council [as heard] it should be remarked this was the first time it had assembled with those members. It is important that all states displayed an interest in having such a meeting. Something else of importance is it was notable for its atmosphere. There was quite a frank discussion of the processes underway in the countries of Europe and the world. It is important that, although there were differences of opinion, a large measure of accord was reached on all such main, fundamental, and important questions as an assessment of the role of the Warsaw Pact and the need for its reconstruction, considering the creation of a new European security structure and implementing the idea of the common European home. As for what is going on in these countries, this was not, of course, featured as a special topic at this Political Consultative Committee meeting, but nevertheless everyone spoke of it. Generally speaking, what the discussion of this boiled down to was these countries are at the outset of profound transformations. Profound transformations. The need was underscored for continuing cooperation in all spheres.

While voicing my satisfaction over the outcome, I would warn at the same time against the habit that afflicts us all of resting content with what is reflected in the documents, statements, and reports. These only are a basis on which to translate the fruits of the policy of new thinking into totally specific actions essential to the people, and on which to employ the inbuilt opportunities to tackle practical tasks of perestroyka in the economic, scientific, and technological and cultural spheres.

I hope the Supreme Soviet and its committees will deal thoroughly with the issues relating to the visit's outcome. It deserves this. I hope they will observe and monitor all that falls within their remit. First and foremost, of course, our parliament must delve right into the subject of a 50 percent cut in strategic offensive weapons. Now that the basic preliminaries have been signed, and we are advancing along the road toward a treaty, the Supreme Soviet, and above all, its relevant committees should really get involved—right up to the hilt, so to speak—in studying the whole fabric of what is being worked out. At any rate, we may work on the premise the U.S. Congress will set about this treaty in earnest fashion. I do not believe this present composition of the Supreme Soviet will be any less assiduous in discussing and examining this.

The need to, and the advantage of developing interparliamentary ties with the United States and Canada—including at committee and commission level—are perfectly clear. This is now an essential condition for effective implementation of any accords and agreements of state significance, given the genuine role played today by the U.S. Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

So, by and large the Soviet-U.S. summit was a success. It lived up to expectations. A lot of work was done. But ahead lies a bigger, no less difficult and responsible meeting. This meeting has raised Soviet-U.S. dialogue to a new and higher level. That's all I have to say, thank you for your attention.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Attends Federation Council Meeting

Gorbachev Gives Speech

LD1206232590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 90 Second Edition pp 1,3

["M.S. Gorbachev: 'There Is No and Can Be No Going Back to the Command Economy'"]

[Text] As has already been reported, a conference of first secretaries of the central committees of union republic communist parties and CPSU kray and oblast committees was held at the CPSU Central Committee 11 June. We publish the speech delivered at the conference by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Esteemed Comrades!

We have invited you to the CPSU Central Committee in order to take counsel on a number of fundamental questions, and to exchange opinions about the essence of the processes which are taking place in the country, in society, and in the party.

The first is that which is involved in preparations for a market economy. A difficult and complex discussion of this question is taking place in the USSR Supreme Soviet, and in society. A broad spectrum of appraisals and considerations has emerged. Commissions are now at work, and on 13 June the government and the commissions will finally report their positions, approaches, and the conclusions which they have drawn to the Supreme Soviet.

I will not at this stage go into any details either about this stage or the subsequent one. I think that Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov will speak in detail on this question.

I would like to fully acknowledge the remarks made by comrades regarding the fact that this meeting could have been held a little earlier. We will put this down to errors of a tactical nature. But every cloud has a silver lining. Today, following the debate in the Supreme Soviet on the government's report, it is already becoming clearly apparent what we are approaching. For it is no secret that, in the past, this question was interpreted this way: Once you have a market, that is the road to capitalism; more than that, it is goodbye socialism. Today, people are speaking calmly about a market. Today, people are already thinking about how to approach it, when and by what means, and how to guarantee the social protection of the people.

I recall that the transition to a money exchange relationship was strictly our policy. We set it out at the 27th congress as a necessary step toward the reform of the economy. This was the first, and a still not fully mastered and very difficult step. Remember: in the past, as soon as the question of market relations was raised, it was immediately classified as revisionism. Such an excessively dramatized attitude to the market has in many ways led to the situation we have today. After that came the June plenum, where we formulated all the basic foundations for radical economic reform. Then there was the 19th party conference. Finally, our precongress platform. Today we are speaking about the precise implementation of a political line, principles which you and I have in fact developed in the party. Now it is being transformed into specific formulas and specific approaches.

We have only just got our society in tune with the present times, preparing it for fundamental changes. One could not set out on such a path without preparation, for it is a question of making changes to the base of society. We are essentially making a turn comparable to the one made in October 1917. These changes in the base are leading us to a mixed economy: By means of laws on property, land, and leasing they are leading us, with the reshaping of property relations, to new forms of economic life. If one takes into account that our federation is also being reshaped in parallel, then all this taken together is determining the new society that we want to have, and toward which—as a matter of fact—we are moving.

Is this in conformity with our policy of perestroyka, the sense of which is to open wide the potential of socialism, to impart to it a democratic, humane character? Or are we, in implementing this course, straying from the path—and even going backwards?

Let us try to look at this with our eyes open. We see that some people directly associate the transition to the market with the radical reshaping of property relations, regarding this as an important step, in order to set the task of privatizing the whole economy later on. We can see this train of thought in various platforms. They are still giving this various wrappings, and even concealing it. This is understandable: Our society will not accept another system based on other values. You and I pose the question in the following manner: Will there be a way to the market for us that does not contradict the essence of the socialist idea, to help to create such a society in practice, a social and cultural sphere in which a person can live well, feel confident, and be free? Besides the political freedom which has been opened up by means of political reform, it is a question of our getting to the main thing—to the economic freedom which puts a person in the situation of the master, unites him with the means and the results of labor. But it was right at the end of his life, unfortunately, that Lenin came up against this in earnest.

You and I, comrades, are on the threshold of a very sharp turn in social development, which will radically change our whole way of life. We are not only put on our guard here by the difficulties of the transition period. There may also be distortions. The working people's state, stimulating market relations through its legislative activity, at the same time also creates a system of social protection, shielding society from stratification, polarizations in income, and the emergence of parasite classes. All this has to be foreseen and tackled along the way.

If we do not permit distortions, the regulated market economy will indeed bring us toward achieving the goal which we are setting within the framework for the implementation of the socialist idea, the socialist option.

Only such a road is in agreement with our line of improving the people's standard of living. If we let this moment go, and leave everything as it was before, then the standard of living in our country will start to fall, and protracted stagnation will set in.

A mighty technological revolution is in progress in the world. But we, with our command-administrative form of management of the economy, have essentially found ourselves in a condition in which scientific-technical progress is being held back. The lag in technology is growing. Moreover, the individual himself finds himself in an environment where he has no serious incentive for growth, for self-improvement, initiative, enterprise. And so, from any point of view, this system of administration has already exhausted itself. That is the first point.

Secondly, on the standard of living and the dangers of its being lowered. If someone now shoulders the responsibility and is prepared to present a draft fully guaranteeing that the reform will have no effect whatsoever on price formation—this is not serious, comrades. It is another matter whereby it is now necessary to fully calculate everything to minimize risk and the lowering of the population's standard of living. That is what must be worked on! Regarding this, I think that, during publication of the discussion at the Supreme Soviet session, precisely that subject—the subject of guarantees—was inadequately treated. For example, the draft stipulates that the basic food and industrial goods that are meant to safeguard day-to-day life are regulated and monitored, which is very important at the first stage. But people have taken this to mean that the intention is to solve everything by raising prices. Clearly, both in the report at the Supreme Soviet session and in the discussion, insufficient attention was devoted to this side of the matter.

Much is being said about the forthcoming raising of retail prices for bread products. I will put it bluntly: Society has been posing this question for a long time now. Many people are writing to the Central Committee: The measure is correct, in order to foster a caring attitude toward bread. People are even, apparently, prepared to forgo compensation. In this instance then, society has been prepared, since everyone realizes that bread is priceless, and that there is no food that equals it. And it is a food that we have. That is very important

during the transition. It is one matter if the price is raised, but there is still nothing on the counters, as before, and another matter if goods are lying around in abundance.

It is still hard to forecast now, but there is, perhaps, some point in taking just one product and seeing how society will react to price increases, and what compensation for the increases it will consider fair.

Why are people still criticizing the plan? They say that it is not clear how we will introduce a market when our "tools" are not ready. But the point is that we need this seven or eight month preparatory period precisely to work on it. We should adopt a law on taxes, an antimonopoly law, a law on entrepreneurialism, on small and medium-sized enterprises, laws on credit-financial and banking systems, on a stock exchange, and on social welfare. We cannot enter the market without all this. The establishment of an infrastructure which is necessary for the market, plus social welfare machinery—all this should be thoroughly planned.

Now, a few words about why we need the market right now, and not earlier or later. Some people are saying that we are already too late. I do not share this point of view. Imagine that we had attempted to transfer to a market economy in 1987 when we had just obtained a credit of confidence from congress. It was utterly impossible then. The majority of enterprises had not yet transferred to financial autonomy and self-financing. How could one go into the market at once without knowing anything, without having tried or tested anything? This would have been the most perfect example of adventurism in politics. We all had to somehow stop being so hidebound and understand, clarify, what is a leasing, a cooperative, a commercial bank, and we had to realize that if we did not change our attitudes to ownershp there should be no talk of new forms of economic life. We had to pass through all this. We had to take the knocks and draw the lessons. I am sure that some mistakes could have been avoided. But there is no doubt that we had to go through all this.

Why should one not delay over the market? Because we are on the threshold of even more negative processes in the economy. Such a situation and such an economic environment which would open the door to positive trends has to be created now. And so, the moment for the transition to the market has been determined. It is important now to carry out the preparatory period in such a way as to move toward the objective on the whole front, not allowing failures on any of the flanks, be it the taxation system, the pricing system, or insurance mechanisms, which would adequately reflect the economic processes and the realities of economic life. I am convinced of one thing: There is no return to the command system economy, nor can there be. Let us at last tell the people the whole truth about this system. In terms of resources, for instance, we are no worse off than the United States. Yet, if you look at the national income: Per capita, it is doubled over there. The economic system in our country is such that it is eating up our national resources. The reason for the lagging behind is not in technology itself, but in whether a person is interested in the results of his work. If we create a new economic environment for man, for the worker, then we will put an end to the "eating up" of resources. The whole world has gone through that, and I am sure of this, having recently met prominent economists from the United States, Japan, and other countries. We can create such an environment if we correctly launch the work to form a socialist market economy.

You know, discussion has been sharp in the Supreme Soviet. I think that the Supreme Soviet is acting correctly. It plans to take note of the government's concept, as far as I know, and to instruct the USSR Council of Ministers to discuss all questions before 1 September and to clarify them, to outline a program of practical actions, taking account of all remarks.

And only after that, present a renewed concept to the Supreme Soviet commissions, which will be the ones to give the final answer—as to whether it is to be or not to be, whether it is on or not on.

At the same time all preparatory work must not be dragged out until autumn: Action must be taken. How do I see this? In the framework of the government, of the Presidential Council, in the framework of the Supreme Soviet, the whole normative basis must be created—and that is a great volume of work. The Supreme Soviet tends to opt for adoption of government decisions to a time schedule—where the Supreme Soviet does not manage to pass the appropriate bill.

Secondly, energetic use has to be made of the potential by way of bodies of state and economic administration, and party political influence has to be brought to bear in order to achieve the maximum possible results in the sphere of the economy in the current year. We shall not forget: The better the basis the less painful the transitional period.

And, at last, the final point. You will no doubt agree with me that the greatest difficulty awaiting us lies not in the economic but the psychological aspect. I would express this difficulty in the following words: Our consciousness today is absolutely nonmarket. Absolutely! Neither mine nor yours, nor that of the broad strata of the people. Therefore, today, generally speaking, the most painful thing is the fact that our designs in the sphere of the economy are based on unpreparedness and immaturity of social consciousness.

No one here will present us with ready-made social thinking. It must take shape in two ways: By means of mastering the renewed forms of life and by means of explaining what this transition to the market means. At this stage the party should work very hard. For we do not need the market in itself. Perhaps someone thinks that someone else is enduring sleepless nights and cannot take his mind off how to push the market through. I am convinced that life itself has brought us to this step. It

was hard going to reach it. This is the logical development of all that we have done in the five years of perestroyka. This cannot be abolished if we really want in the end to give powerful stimuli, motives—by means of the market—in order to come up with different results and attain a different standard of living.

We all probably have to prepare for a certain temporary inconvenience. But I would like to say straight away: Before you shout "help!" get to the bottom of things. If necessary, we will get to the bottom of it together, too. Here we should all be in the same boat. There is no need to pass the buck—either by those above to those below, or by those below to those above. I think that is absolutely clear.

Why am I speaking about this? Because unless we are agreed on it, especially in the circle of people who are placed at a certain high level at this crucial historical stage, then I will tell you frankly: Any cause will get choked!

People are saying, what do we need this market for? Because it is the economic freedom that, as it were, makes processes uncontrollable. But when you start to get to the bottom of it, to the root of the issue, it becomes clear that frequently such doubters are not anxious because of the interest in the matter at hand, but because of personal interest: They are, as it were, losing power, they say they are being left without power.

Do such conversations take place? They do. Let us make these things clear. What aims are we talking about? About attaining forms of life that might lead to a different society and different living conditions, or about simply hanging on to power for someone, regardless of what this power gives people?

No, comrades. We have conceived a truly world-wide and profound turning point, and it is necessary to head for it and to direct all one's intellectual potential toward it. I think that will be one of the central issues at the 28th party congress. But a constructive conversation is required, comrades. We can all demolish things. But what we really need today is to put together, grain by grain, everything that will enrich our knowledge and experience so as to go forward without losses and bring the whole of society to a new state.

Now, comrades, a few thoughts regarding the forthcoming forum of Russian communists. The question is a very large and many-sided one. V.A. Medvedev spoke about it in detail.

Last Saturday, there was a joint sitting of the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and of the preparatory committee, made up of representatives of all party organizations. Quite an interesting conversation ensued. The position that emerged at the sitting was crystal clear: The conference should be turned into a congress. The congress should be called a constituent congress, and the Communist Party of Russia should be formed at it.

I would like to convey to those attending the meeting the request of the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee of the preparatory committee of the Russian party conference, which will, apparently, set itself up as the constituent congress of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party. Comrades have asked that this circumstance should be brought to the notice of the leaders of the fraternal communist parties. So I do not consider that the Russians are, in some way, trying to do something in secret. No. In fact, the subject of a Russian Communist Party featured constantly in the precongress discussion. The question now is just one of seeing that the creation of a Communist Party of Russia promotes the strengthening of the federation, the unity of all the peoples and, of course, the strengthening of the CPSU as a single party.

I must say that this idea meets with support everywhere in Russia. At the same time, it is not excluded that someone will try to take advantage of the new situation and will say: What are we to do when 58 percent at the CPSU Congress are [members of the] RCP [Russian Communist Party]? When it is essentially a congress of one republican party, and all decisions depend on how its delegates vote. What kind of democratism can one speak about then?

The members of the preparatory committee first wanted to give the assurance that they advocated that the role of the whole CPSU should not only not be restricted, but on the contrary, should be raised. In view of this they asked the leadership of the Central Committee to discuss the following. If a RCP is formed there must be a detailed discussion of its representation in the Central Committee and in other elected bodies, especially the machinery of voting, and the congress must be presented with the appropriate concept of this. I am saying this in order to anticipate any questions straightaway.

The goal of the Communists of Russia is that the creation of the RCP should work for the good of Russia itself, of the party and the whole Union alike.

In this sense it is extraordinarily important that those coming into the RCP leadership should be people understanding this responsibility and role for Russia, for the communists, for the party. The question has arisen as to what the new party should be called. There is a Communist Party of the Ukraine, there is a Communist Party of Belorussia. One does not say: The Communist Party of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. But here there are three options: Russian Communist Party, Communist Party of Russia, Communist Party of the RSFSR. Not simply of the Russian Federation but of the RSFSR. How about that for originality! I think we will put forward all three of these options for discussion. Let the people of Russia discuss it themselves, let them decide.

What else should be said? The members of the preparatory committee have reached agreement to hold the forum of Communists of Russia in two stages. At the first, the platform, the rules are to be discussed, a first

secretary is to be elected by congress, then the Central Committee is to be elected, and with the leading bodies now in place, a congress must be held. The second part of the forum is to be held after the 28th congress, and there the report drafted by the new leadership must be discussed, in the context of the results of the 28th congress, and in the context of the tasks of the people of Russia, so as to work out a program of action for Russia. No doubt that is correct.

Those are the considerations I wanted to share at this conference.

New National Structure Viewed

LD1206192990 Moscow TASS in English 1916 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 12 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev today presided over a meeting of the Federation Council, which assembled in the Kremlin to discuss problems of the Soviet Union's national-state structure.

Participants in the meeting spoke about the urgent need to work out and conclude a new Union Treaty, which will guarantee the actual economic and political sovereignty of the Union republics and their effective interaction.

The union of sovereign socialist republics, created on this basis, will envisage various forms of links, taking into account national, historical, economic and cultural peculiarities of different republics.

Equitable and mutually beneficial economic relations, emerging as a result of transition to a market economy, are expected to act as a powerful cementing force in the renewed Union.

It was decided to create a working group, which will include plenipotentiary representatives of all republics, in order to work out a draft new Union Treaty.

President Mikhail Gorbachev summed up the results of the discussion.

Leaders Address Meeting

LD1206200290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 12 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] As we have already reported, there was a meeting of the Federation Council in the Kremlin today, under the chairmanship of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the USSR. It was devoted to the problems of the national-state structure of the USSR. Addressing the members of the Federation Council, Comrade Gorbachev said, in part: [video shows Gorbachev, seated, addressing meeting]

[Begin Gorbachev recording] This is precisely the meeting at which we agreed to begin the practical work of implementing everything that has been worked out at the political, economic, and legal level. So, at this meeting today I would like to speak a little bit now on a philosophical and political level about the approaches—and also on the practical level—taking into account the fact that this process is proceeding from below. That means that it is proceeding correctly, in the sense that it is from below. As to how it is going, that is something we will discuss. It is proceeding from below. All of this gives us the opportunity to rely on the experience that exists, in order to draw up a program of action as to time schedules, measures, and—what is most important—forms for implementing the chief idea of the deep reformation of our federation, the national state.

In essence, that is the main task of the present meeting of the Federation Council, and I propose that we should now speak here in the spirit of adhering to principle and frankness. [end recording]

[Announcer] In their speech the participants in the discussion spoke about the need for immediately elaborating and concluding a new Union Treaty, which would guarantee the real economic and political sovereignty of the republics and efficient cooperation among them. The union of sovereign socialist states being set up on this basis would envisage various forms of links, taking into account these specific national historic, economic, and cultural features. As many of the speakers noted, the equal and mutually advantageous economic relations that would be formed among the republics as a result of the transfer to the market were hailed as the powerful cementing force of a renewed union.

In order to draw up the draft of the new Union Treaty, it was deemed necessary to set up a working group comprising plenipotentiary representatives of all republics.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev summed up the results of the discussion.

The meeting was addressed by Ivashko, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]; Dementey, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Belorussian SSR; Ryuytel, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian SSR; Nazarbayev, president of the Kazakh SSR; Snegur, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Moldavian SSR; Mutalibov, president of the Azerbaijan SSR; Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR; Gumbaridze, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Georgian SSR; Voskanyan, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR; Gorbunov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian SSR; Niyazov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Turkmenian SSR; Makhkamov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Tajik SSR; (Shaimeyev) chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Tatar Autonomous SSR; Lukyanov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR; Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic; Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of

Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR; and Yakovlev, member of the Presidential Council of the USSR.

On the same day, Mikhail Sergeyevich and Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov received Gorbunov, Landsbergis, and Ryuytel, who were in Moscow in connection with the meeting of the Federation Council. There was an exchange of opinions on the situation which has arisen in interethnic relations.

Gorbachev Receives Patriarch Aleksiy 12 Jun

Meeting Held

LD1206164890 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 12 TASS—It is officially announced here that Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev received Patriarch Aleksiy of Moscow and all Russia and permanent members of the holy synod of the Russian Orthodox Church in the Kremlin on June 12.

Gorbachev congratulated Aleksiy with the election to the high post and expressed hope that the Russian Orthodox Church will continue to contribute to strengthening the unity and cohesion of Soviet society, to reviving the country's intellectual and cultural values.

Patriarch Aleksiy and members of the holy synod assured the Soviet president that the church will act in the spirit of accord to promote perestroyka and renewal and to boost the spiritual and moral potential of entire people.

Gorbachev Greeting to Patriarch

PM1206090390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Undated message from USSR President M. Gorbachev to newly elected Orthodox Church leader Patriarch Aleksiy]

[Text] To Patriarch Aleksiy of Moscow and all Russia

Accept my sincere congratulations in connection with your election as patriarch of Moscow and all Russia.

May I take this formal opportunity to express the hope that the efforts of the Russian Orthodox Church, along with the clergy and believers of other religions and churches, will be channeled into unifying our compatriots and all people of goodwill, regardless of their philosophy and political convictions, and creating a new, humane, and just human society.

I wish you success in this lofty mission of philanthropy, mercy, and peace.
[signed] USSR President M. Gorbachev.

Ryzhkov Greeting to Patriarch

PM1206090590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Undated message from USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N. Ryzhkov to newly elected Orthodox Church leader Patriarch Aleksiy]

[Text] To Patriarch Aleksiy of Moscow and All Russia

I cordially congratulate you on your election as patriarch of Moscow and All Russia.

I am sure that the Russian Orthodox Church will continue to make a weighty contribution to the cause of uniting our multiethnic motherland's patriotic forces and strengthening peace.

Allow me to pay my profound respects to you and wish you health and success in your lofty mission.
[signed] N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Restrictions Placed on KGB by Draft Law

AU1206181590 Paris AFP in English 1734 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 12 (AFP)—The State Security Committee (KGB) may tap telephone conversations, control mail and enter any home, day or night, in carrying out its mission, according to a draft law released Tuesday by INTERFAX, a semi-independent news agency. The KGB, however, will first have to obtain an order from the procurator before it can place wiretaps and will have to ensure "the observance of socialist legality in its own activities", according to the bill—the first in Soviet history to codify the role and prerogatives of the security service.

"The KGB defends the sovereignty and constitutional order of the USSR, as well as the country's economic and defence potential, and guards the state borders of the USSR," the bill says. It "engages in intelligence and counter-intelligence work, investigates crimes coming under its jurisdiction, and conducts administrative, military and other security-protecting activities allowed by the USSR laws," the bill also says.

The KGB is responsible for collecting information and analysis on "the intentions and plans of foreign countries" as well as "political and other foreign organisations which might endanger the Soviet Union's security interests".

It is also charged with counter-intelligence work, including the fight against "high treason, espionage, terrorist acts, subversion, contraband and the more dangerous forms of organised crime". It also carries out counter-intelligence work inside the armed forces, defends state borders, statesmen and foreign missions inside the Soviet Union.

The KGB is also involved in "preventing disruptions at nuclear power stations, oil and gas pipelines, transport and other vital economic installations".

It provides information to the Soviet president, the council of ministers and parliament.

The draft law stipulates that the KGB also reports to parliament, to the council of ministers and to the president and that the Supreme Soviet's committee for defence and national security regularly hears reports by leading KGB officials. The security service is to be controlled judicially by the procurator's office and, financially, by the finance ministry.

KGB officers are allowed to make use of their weapons in emergency situations. But they may only use them against women and people under the age of 18 in cases of "armed assault, armed resistance or dangerous group attacks".

The KGB is allowed to detain, search and question people suspected of crimes coming under its jurisdiction. Diplomats, however, may only be subject to a identity check, the bill says.

Peasants Congress Proceedings Continue

Ligachev Speech Criticized

LD1206171990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 12 June carries a three-minute report by correspondent Semen Astakhov on the 12 June proceedings of the Peasants Congress, where, Astakhov says, "passions boiled today."

He notes that the criticism of yesterday's supplementary report by Nikitin continued and that today's speakers continued to analyze the reasons for the state of the agro-industrial complex.

"Impartial criticism" was often made of the speech delivered by Ye. Ligachev at the Peasants' Congress yesterday, Astakhov reports. "Delegates noted that there was no program of the future of the countryside in the supplementary paper or in his speech," Astakhov says.

Astakhov then plays part of his interview with Deputy (Zalichkin), recorded in the congress interval, who said that the Peasants' Congress supports all forms of farm management.

Ligachev on Agricultural Prospects

LD1306093890 Moscow TASS in English 0832 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 13 TASS—A decision to set a Soviet peasant's union was passed on June 12 by a constituent congress of this new socio-political organisation. It was addressed by Politburo Member Yegor Ligachev.

Ligachev said he was certain that Soviet agriculture would continue to rely on state and cooperative ventures, integrated with individual and family farms.

Sharing views on the prospects of peasant households in the USSR, Ligachev noted that Soviet farmers, who preferred to work on such principles, should be supported by the state and the peasants union. But the choice of the kind of farming should be completely voluntary and economically sound.

Reportage on Preparations for CPSU Congress

No Foreign Guests Permitted

LD1306105390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1011 GMT 13 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 13 June— For the first time in many years, there will be no foreign guests at the CPSU Congress which opens at the beginning of July. This became known today.

Vadim Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, reported at the first meeting with journalists at the congress press center that this important matter was discussed in the Politburo. "In view of the particular working nature of the congress, the emphasis on the discussion of internal problems and the limited opportunities for work with guests, the invitation for foreign delegations to attend the congress is not envisaged. At the same time, it is planned fully to publish possible greetings from parties and movements and to employ the press representatives of the corresponding parties and movements in the interests of party cooperation," he said.

At the same time, the foreign public will be able to obtain wide-ranging information about the congress through representatives of the press, for whom daily briefings and meetings with delegates will be held. Vadim Medvedev also reported that a stenographic account of the congress will be published in the newspaper "PRAVDA", the CPSU central organ, and there will be recorded relays of the congress proceedings on USSR central television.

Medvedev Outlines Work Details

LD1306112490 Moscow TASS in English 1043 GMT 13 Jun 90

[By TASS Correspondents Igor Yefimov and Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow June 13 TASS— Preparations for the forthcoming 28th CPSU Congress and Russia's Communist Party conference are well advanced, Soviet Communist Party Politburo member Vadim Medvedev told journalists today.

The CPSU Congress, scheduled to open in Moscow on July 2, will be attended by approximately by 4,700 delegates. They were elected mainly on alternative lines. Each seat was contested on the average by five candidates.

This democratic novelty had certain side effects. The elected delegates do not reflect exactly the social structure of the Soviet Communist Party. Few workers and peasants were elected (11.6 and 4.8 per cent respectively). Medvedev recalled the number of workers and peasants elected to the previous 27th congress—42 and nine per cent. In view of this, the party leadeship has decided to invite 350 workers and peasants to the congress. It is up to the congress to decide their status.

Medvedev said the 28th congress will discuss the drafts of the CPSU platform and the party rules. Moreover, it is planned to adopt several special resolutions, particularly on relationships with other parties, the party press, steps to combat nationalism, chauvinism and separatism.

As the Russian Party conference, which will open on June 19, it will most probably turn into a constituent congress of the Communist Party of Russia, Medvedev said (so far the Russian Federation was the only republic of the USSR without its own communist party).

Medvedev and two other secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee—Georgiy Razumovskiy and Yuriy Manayenkov—replied to questions for a whole hour in the first press conference on the events. Many correspondents asked about the future of the CPSU as a political force. Admitting that a withdrawal from the CPSU was continuing (approximately 120-130,000 people left the party during the opening months of this year, as many as through 1989), Medvedev stressed that the congress's principal documents should play a consolidating role. "The CPSU leadership," he said, "wants to promote consolidation and oppose divison so that all perestroyka forces could work in one harness."

Delegates Elected Abroad

PM0706093190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under the rubric "In Party Organizations" and the general heading: "Elected Delegates"]

[Text] A conference of party organizations of Soviet establishments abroad was held in Moscow 5-6 June in accordance with a resolution of the CPSU Central Committee March (1990) Plenum.

Meetings (conferences) of primary party organizations had named 35 candidate delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress. Ten congress delegates were elected by secret ballot, according to the norms of representation: A.A. Bessmertnykh, Yu.M. Vorontsov, A.V. Darchiyev, Yu.V. Dubinin, V.N. Kazimirov, Yu.A. Kvitsinskiy, V.M. Nikiforov, V.N. Rayevskiy, N.N. Solovyev, and V.M. Falin.

Shostakovskiy Loses Election

WA1106192790 Moscow VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA in Russian 28 May 90 p 1

[Article by T. Yeloyev: "Bystrov or Shostakovskiy? The Conference Elects Bystrov"]

[Text] As was to be expected, passions flared up at the Frunzenskiy Rayon party conference because of two candidate delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress—N.V. Bystrov, secretary of the party and head of a section of a department at the Moscow Motor Vehicles and Highway Institute, and V.N. Shostakovskiy, rector of the Moscow Higher Party School. Most of the speakers agreed that both of them are worthy contenders, with their own positions and assessments of the processes under way in the party and society.

However, first let us digress a little. Communists of the rayon were to elect 14 delegates to the congress in single-seat districts. Thirteen contenders won in the course of a difficult struggle, including M.S. Gorbachev, USSR president and CPSU Central Committee General Secretary, and Yu.D. Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee], and member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

As far as the 11th district is concerned, in which there were five candidates in the first round, N.V. Bystrov and V.N. Shostakovskiy made it to the second round. Votes had to be counted several times, because a number of ballots initially found invalid were awarded by the district electoral commission alternatively to this or that contender for the delegate credentials. Besides, the party organization had complaints to make about the work of this commission. On top of this, one of the ballot boxes turned out to contain several ballots too many. This is why the rayon party electoral commission submitted the issue of electing a delegate to a conference.

What is to be done? Various suggestions were made, including the expediency of holding elections in the district once again. After a protracted debate, it was resolved to elect a delegate at the current conference.

Both contenders presented their programs. It is hardly worthwhile to recount the content of V.N. Shostakovskiy's program, which is well-known to the communists due to his statements in the central and city press and on television. Among others, on 11 May VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA carried an interview with him, "To Leave the CPSU?" As one of the members of the Coordinating Council of the "Democratic Platform in the CPSU," he is in favor of the need for democratic renewal in the CPSU, up to turning it into a party of a new type. In his opinion, this may be ensured by the existence of factions which would make it possible for the CPSU to catch a second wind in its current difficult situation. He believes that factions are needed at a certain definite stage in a transition to a multiparty system.

Numerous questions and responses to them made it possible for all participants in the conference to make their choices. The results of a secret vote showed the following distribution of votes by the delegates: in favor of N.V. Bystrov—367 out 553, and in favor of V.N. Shostakovskiy—169. This came as a surprise to many people because in the district both had almost equal numbers of supporters.

What was attractive in the program of 37-year-old N.V. Bystrov? He advocates, passionately and with conviction, profound democratic transformations in the party and society on the principle "the free development of everyone is a condition for the free development of all." He believes that the CPSU should be a political party protecting the interests of the working segment of society and advocating radical reforms in all spheres, but rejecting the idea of transforming our society into a capitalist one.

Along with differences, N.V. Bystrov notes the common points of the Democratic Platform and the CPSU Central Committee Platform. They are complete glasnost with regard to the issues of party budget and direct, competitive elections to all party organs. Even if there are factions, they should not be ossified, and should not turn into clannishness. Indeed, the opinion of the minority needs to be taken into account. At the same time, one voice should not be allowed to matter as much as 10,000. Otherwise, the party will completely lose its ability to act jointly. N.V. Bystrov is against the resolution of the Coordinating Council of the Democratic Platform, "On the Situation in the CPSU," in which the formation of a new political party is proclaimed. In this case, it is just unethical to remain in the CPSU, to say nothing of receiving a salary from party funds.

As N.V. Bystrov sees it, at the forthcoming congress, the CPSU should have a clear-cut position on ways to overcome the economic crisis in the country. He is in favor of creating a republic party organization of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] as an organic component of the CPSU.

The delegates of the conference discussed the position of the rayon Communists for the 28th congress of the party. First Secretary of the CPSU Rayon Committee G.I. Kutnyakov said in his report that a vigorous discussion of the draft Central Committee Platform is under way, as well as that of the alternative documents, the Democratic and Marxist Platforms, the Political Position of the Moscow Conference of Secretaries of the Primary Party Organizations, and others. The discussion has revealed various points of view on the role of the party in our society and the principles of its internal structure.

Communists of the rayon party organization support provisions of the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the most part. However, they note that many wordings in this document lack clarity and specificity. For example, why is the attitude toward the communist idea altogether absent? It is necessary to stress that the CPSU is a party which advocates the socialist option and the prospect of communist development. In the process, communism should be understood as democratic movement toward a better future based on general human values, toward spiritual and material wealth for all members of society.

Participants in the conference stated their attitude toward a regulated market economy which is expected. The party is called upon to evaluate in a responsible manner the consequences of the first stage of our transition to it—price increases, the growth of inflation, the decline of production, the closure and bankruptcy of many unprofitable enterprises or those with low profit margins, unemployment, a drop in the standard of living, and the stratification of the populace in terms of income and financial affluence. This is why the adoption of comprehensive measures should be preceded by an in-depth discussion and a political decision of the 28th CPSU Congress.

The delegates adopted a resolution which expresses the position of the rayon party organization for the congress.

Yu.D. Maslyukov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, took part in the proceedings and spoke at the conference. He responded to questions concerning the economic situation of the country and ways to switch to a regulated market economy.

Draft Platform Discussion Held

WA0806194690 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 5 Jun 90 p 2

[Report on interview with Professors Zh.T. Toshchenko and V.Ye. Boykov, director and deputy director respectively of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences Sociological Research Center, by SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent T. Alekseyeva; date and place not specified: "Dreamboat or Action Program?"]

[Text] Everyone is aware that ever-increasing difficulties are emerging in our life today. What is not entirely clear is something else—who, what force is capable of halting this process, and how? The new public movements, organizations, and parties, whose number today, according to some figures, is over a hundred, do not permit big hopes to be nurtured on this score if only because of their "junior" age and, consequently, certain inexperience, lack of coordination in action and so forth. What, then, is left? The Communist Party? It is only the laziest, perhaps, who refrains from criticism of it today. However, granted all this, it is, as before, under the conditions of the instability brought about by the most diverse social collisions, including revocation of Article 6, the backbone of our society's political system. And in the foreseeable future this will be practically the sole real force capable of the organization of the most difficult work on extricating the country from the crisis. And the "plan" of this work could with every justification, most likely, be considered the draft Central Committee Platform for the congress. Discussion of this document is

now into its third month. What is the opinion of the public? The answer to this question is given at the request of SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent T. Alekseyeva by specialists directly involved in study of it. The viewpoints they express coincide, and for this reason we publish their answers to SELSKAYA ZHIZN's questions without specific indentification.

So to our interviewees—Professors Zh.T. Toshchenko and V.Ye. Boykov, director and deputy director of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences Sociological Research Center.

[Answer] Since the date of publication of the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform our center has conducted three all-Union studies. As a result a picture of the political situation in the country, in which certain tendencies have been distinctly manifested, has been obtained.

What is the essence of it? The political crisis in the country continues to intensify. The state of unsteady balance is growing increasingly manifested into an acute-conflict situation fraught with unpredictable events, the excuse for which could be even a relatively insignificant occurrence. An indicator of this is specifically the ever-increasing dissatisfaction of the majority of people with the actual economic, social, and political results of perestroyka, the loss by many people of hope for an improvement in life in the coming year or two, a buildup of anxiety and mental fatigue from the political disarray, the devaluation of former values, and finally the continued decline in the authority of power, including the serious lack of public confidence in political leaders at all levels of administration.

[Alekseyeva] But to clarify the picture—which specific factors are exasperating people the most?

[Answer] They fall in the following order: the increased prices, commodity shortages, crime, environmental problems, the orgy of the "black market," every conceivable manifestation of social injustice, the growing callousness and spitefulness in relations between people, and interethnic conflicts. Each of these problems is worrying from half to an absolute majority of those polled. And the significance of each is practically equivalent—a solution of the environmental problem, say, would not do away with the question of crime, and the latter does not screen the seriousness of the shortage of food.

The conclusion which follows is highly disturbing: People are increasingly dissatisfied with the progress of perestroyka because it is their personal safety and well-being that are really threatened today. And the increase in anxiety and hopelessness is moving at a menacing pace, what is more: The proportion of those polled at the end of this April who emphasized increased tension compared only with this February had almost doubled.

[Alekseyeva] But it was in February that the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform was published. What is the connection between the latter two facts—the publication of a document which, it would seem, was to have given people hope and the fact that not only has this not happened but, on the contrary....

[Answer] Words, of course, have great power, but they are not deeds. However, they precede deeds and work. And the draft platform should, I believe, have represented, so to speak, a clear-cut and convincing plan of the CPSU's activity for the coming period, a plan of really effective measures, what is more. Judging from the material of the poll, the population perceived this document guardedly, in general. And in time its attractiveness has begun to diminish. What might it be advisable to do in this connection?

It would seem necessary first of all to arrange the platform differently. Man and his well-being should be given pride of place. In other words, we should not be proceeding in accordance with such traditional blocs as political reform, economic and social policy, and international activity. From the generally accepted viewpoint this is, it would seem, not in doubt, but people today are worried by entirely specific problems, which already have society by the throat. It is this that should be taken as the starting point, and their solution should constitute the core of the platform.

We would recall that when the earthquake occurred in Armenia, everything else was instantly put on the back burner. So it should be in this case also. After all, the rise in crime, the commodity shortage, the complex state of the environment—these are not problems of prosperity, as they were called for a long time; they are today questions of the very existence of each of us. This is an entirely different quality—the perception of a direct threat to personal safety. Therefore the platform should plan primarily a solution of problems in these priority areas. This is the first point.

Second, clear concentration of attention on them would ensure the representation in this document of people's interests and its attractiveness for an absolute majority and, consequently, a consolidation of healthy forces interested in the achievement of results. After all, it is paradoxical that this document is, seemingly, geared to the defense of people's interests, but they (this is what the studies have shown) perceive it in an estranged manner, as the concern merely of the party, as a political credo in which they see no place for themselves. The result is that many people do not identify themselves and their interests with the party's aims and intentions. This, in our view, is the biggest defect of the draft. In this form it is a complex of ideas which the party wishes to realize. Whereas the party should be expressing what is desired by the people, the majority of the population. And even were this desire not to be made a part of a harmonious, scientifically substantiated program, the degree of its influence and its power would be multiplied a hundredfold.

Third, in the opinion of respondents, the draft platform contains many ideas, words, and expressions which are correct in themselves but which have been devalued in the past. Such phrases as, for example, "fidelity to the creative spirit of the materialist philosophy and dialectical methodology of Marx, Engels, and Lenin" and such like. We can agree with them in general, it would hardly be right to expunge Marx, Engels, and Lenin from the category of great thinkers and politicians. But the whole point is that such expressions and the names of these people have been sullied by dogmatic interpretation of their theoretical and political quest. Three-fourths of the members of the CPSU (!) who were polled declared that the theory of Marxism-Leninism is in need of a cleansing of fossils and dogmatic teachings. It would therefore be better to remove such phrases.

The next suggestion is directly linked with the previous one. The entire draft is expounded in such traditionally rounded wording that it slides by, not sticking in a person's mind for a second. It is not only that an answer is not given as to how, in what way, the party plans a way out of the crisis, this is further set forth in the old way. In a word, the platform's fundamental political propositions should be expressed by way of the concerns and desires of the ordinary individual. And all this should be set forth in entirely different language—simple, intelligible, recognizable, perhaps. Recent issues of the journal DIALOG have been providing a dictionary of the terms employed in the draft Central Committee Platform. What kind of political document addressed to the people is it, one wonders, that requires deciphering?! And much, incidentally, needs to be explained in it because it is not today only some old woman in the village but also leading economists who are hardly unequivocally interpreting such formulas as, for example, "planned and market" economy. Or is it clear to anyone what is meant by the term "earned collective property"? Vague expressions cannot attract people. It is not a question of setting forth the text in primitive language but of it being necessary to employ, in the main, concepts which have analogies in reality.

And, finally, such great attention paid in the draft platform to questions of an organizational-party nature is hardly warranted. After all, the draft rules are being studied in parallel....

[Alekseyeva] It is difficult, impossible for a person to live without hope of a better tomorrow. What is public opinion on this score?

[Answer] Yes, we told ourselves for many years: Alright, so be it—life is hard and difficult, but for our children.... But today it is primarily in respect of the children that there is no confidence. This is really frightening. And studies show that such a mood is predominant. Only 10 percent of the population looks for positive changes in the economy in the next year or two, for example, and in the interethnic sphere, 14 percent. The rest are either doubtful or have altogether no hopes of anything. But man truly cannot live without hope, otherwise he sinks into apathy or aggression.

[Alekseyeva] And with what do people link their hopes for an improvement in their lives?

[Answer] Primarily with the switch to a market economy. A few figures in confirmation: The cooperatives today are supported by 48 percent of the population (more than those "against"), although this is today most problematical. On the side of private property are 52 percent, and of leasing, 82 percent. Such is the actual picture of public opinion today and of public interest. And if, say, it is superimposed on the propositions of the draft platform, they largely do not coincide. The draft needs to be "trimmed" to these figures.

[Alekseyeva] Do your researches provide an answer to the question concerning people's attitude toward the CPSU as a force capable of overcoming the crisis?

[Answer] The situation here is as follows: A majority would like to see the party preserve the leading role because it sees today no other political force capable of replacing the CPSU and fears chaos in the event of it quitting the scene. However, people are becoming increasingly worried that the party is lagging behind the course of events. In this connection more than half (51 percent) declared that it is most important for it now to cleanse its ranks of conservatives. And by virtue of the fact that the renewal process is going very slowly, only 17 percent of those polled count fully on the possibility of this. The rest either have doubts about this or do not expect it at all.

[Alekseyeva] To what extent are all these sentiments characteristic of the rural and urban populations separately? After all, it has traditionally been the customary belief that the inhabitants of the countryside are more conservative. And are there differences in the attitude toward the draft platform among these two groups of the population?

[Answer] It is profoundly wrong today to speak of the conservatism of the countryside. And the attitude of the inhabitants of the countryside toward the platform is roughly the same as that of workers. The dividing line runs elsewhere. Level of education, position—these are what determine the evaluations. And a condescending attitude toward villagers is testimony to our general lack of breeding. Because the villagers today largely win out over townspeople. They have objectively, after all, known how to preserve more traditions in their life. Living permanently in one place, they have preserved the attachment also to their surroundings—the land, orchard, stream, and forest. They more often than not live together in several generations—parents, children, grandfather and grandmother, and grandchildren. Finally, they have property—a home, truck garden, orchard, cow. That is, despite everything, the living shoots of a human attitude toward the world of nature and toward man and, consequently, toward themselves

are objectively preserved among them. But this is altogether the subject of a separate big and serious discussion.

The overall masses of townspeople, on the other hand, have found themselves in a far worse position. Construction workers, transport workers, fishermen, people working in services—how many of them were in their youth torn from their native nest and thrown from one construction project of the century to another, taken away by organized recruitment and given jobs on limited residence permits! In the countryside there are, generally, no people living in hostels, but in the town? And how is the situation where a person works at a giant enterprise at one end of Moscow or Sverdlovsk, but lives at the other, in a "dormitory area," any better. And his home is a place where he only has time to eat and sleep, in the main. And then he goes once again to work, where he turns one and the same component, having only a dim idea of the end overall result. Here all human relationships have broken down, and for this reason the townsperson finds himself more often than not in the position of a marginalized or declasse individual.

People of the country have, perhaps, proven wiser. People refer frequently on this subject to Lenin and his statement concerning the advantages of the proletariat over the peasantry inasmuch as the proletariat is the exponent of progressive ideas, and the peasantry, a benighted, cowed class, in addition, infected to a man with private-property sentiments. So, to put it briefly, at a time of society's revolutionary breakup the proletariat really comes to the fore because it has nothing and has nothing to lose, and there are no regrets about breaking up something belonging to somebody else. But when it comes to be a question of construction and creation, here the peasantry is objectively in a better position, and it is not fortuitous that the hopes of our society are today linked primarily with a revival of the countryside. But this is, we repeat, a most complex, special subject, and in this aspect of the discussion it is possible only to touch on its outlines. The task today lies elsewhere—in the cohesion of all strata of society, for only here lies our salvation. And it is here that the consolidating role of the CPSU Central Committee Platform could be decisive.

Vorotnikov Views Gorbachev Not In Any Danger

PM0606111090 London ITV Television Network in English 1800 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Interview with CPSU Central Committee Politburo member Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov, in Russian with superimposed English translation, by correspondent David Smith in Moscow on 5 June during a channel 4 "News" report on the Soviet political crisis—recorded]

[Text] [Smith] How dangerous is the situation for President Gorbachev, in your view now?

[Vorotnikov] I don't think the situation is dangerous: I see no danger at all. Perestroyka is going on perfectly normally, both in our home affairs and in our foreign policy, as was proved by President Gorbachev in America.

Commentary Doubts Break Up of Soviet Union

LD1206151390 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Commentary by Vitaliy Gurov]

[Text] A session by the Council of the Federation, a consultative body under the USSR president that consists of top statesmen of all the union republics of the country, takes place in Moscow on Tuesday [as heard]. The agenda of the meeting, among other issues, includes an exchange of views on the state of affairs in the Soviet federation, on its future and on the principles of the new union treaty.

Disintegration, confrontation, and a standoff are, alas, notions with an extremely negative meaning that are mentioned more and more often in estimates of the current matters in the Soviet federation, writes our commentator Vitaliy Gurov. Thee are not the main notions but nevertheless they contain a tendency that can be traced to a number of decisions by supreme bodies of power in union republics. There are quite a few examples: thus is secession from the USSR, a path along which the leaders of Lithuania seem to moving too fast apparently. Thus is also the similar decisions taken by the parliaments of Latvia and Estonia.

I think that Moscow has responded in an openly negative way to the decision of the parliament of Moldavia about recognizing Lithuania's independence. Ideas are aired more and more often about the sovereignty of the republics in speeches by MP's [members of parliament] in the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Georgia as well as in some other republics.

At the Congress of Peoples Deputies of Russia proper, the largest Soviet republic, a declaration has been passed about the state sovereignty of the Russian federation. The key articles of the document speak of the supremacy of the republic's constitution and laws over those of the union, of a voluntary transfer of some of its functions and powers to the center, and of the impossibility to change the territory of the republic without its consent, among other articles.

Is it really disintegration? Hardly so! As I see it, the old system of relationships is being revised. Naturally, in such situation it won't be helpful to use ritual incantations about the integrity and strength of the old union, and some political leaders still resort to such incantations. The old federation needs a new structure, which is already taking shape in practical terms, I mean to say the establishment of direct ties between republics and regions, bypassing the complex bureaucratic barriers that were often set up by central agencies. These are not

only economic ties but also political contacts and cultural exchanges. In short, life itself prompts certain decisions.

But what about the future? I am rather inclined to view it with optimism because I trust that the center will give up its ambitions and will find a compromise with proposals that now seem impossible to accept. Every union republic must determine its own standing anew, as it were. And following that a decision must be wsorked out on the basis of consensus. I am certain that such a path will save us from everything I started my notes with—disintegration, confrontation, and a standoff. A dialogue is inevitable. I think that Tuesday's session of the Council of the Federation is the first step along this path.

Government Has Six Months To Show Results

PM0106150690 Madrid ABC in Spanish 29 May 90 p 40

[Interview with Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Leonid Abalkin by Friso Endt; date, place not given]

[Excerpt] The Hague—[introductory passage omitted] [Endt] What are your priorities? Do you want credits, cooperation projects, Western technology?

[Abalkin] We want cooperation in all fields. We want to give our enterprises and their affiliates in the West total freedom to establish their own priorities. But the most important priorities of all are to stabilize our market, the circulation of economic resources in the country, and to find solutions to the whole range of corresponding social problems. Not only Gorbachev's prestige but also the future of perestroyka depends on the outcome of these plans.

[Endt] How solid is Gorbachev's position? How long can he remain in power, especially now that your stores are empty?

[Abalkin] You know perfectly well what the answer to this question is. When consumer goods disappear from the stores a country's leader does not enjoy the population's support. This has always been so. But allow me to say quite clearly that it is my job to achieve rapid results on a large scale. We have six months in which to stabilize the market, to show the population that things are going better, to strengthen perestroyka's authority, and to defend and also strengthen Gorbachev's authority. This is my problem.

[Endt] Is six months not perhaps too short a time?

[Abalkin] Parliament has given us a vote of confidence. Such a vote always has a limit. Unless we succeed in six months new candidates will take charge of government. We cannot resolve all the problems in half a year. But it is important to stabilize things and to show that things are going better. Things are easier downhill; we could recover our breath.

[Endt] What have Gorbachev's worst mistakes been?

[Abalkin] Gorbachev must not be portrayed as a demigod. He does not make his decisions without advice from others. I would like to turn the question round: What mistakes did the Soviet leadership make in the past? Answer: Plenty.

We failed to learn the lessons given to us by other countries when they introduced economic reforms. Reforms must start in agriculture, then in light industry and the services. Everything should have been much quicker.

USSR National Development Law Enacted

WA2905191490 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 May 90 Morning Edition pp 1-2

[USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution "On Enactment of the USSR Law 'On the Free National Development of USSR Citizens Residing Outside Their National-State Formations or Not Having Such Formations on USSR Territory'"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To enact the USSR Law "On the Free National Development of USSR Citizens Residing Outside Their National-State Formations or Not Having Such Formations on USSR Territory" from the moment of its promulgation.

2. That the supreme soviets of union and autonomous republics will bring union and autonomous republic legislation into conformance with the USSR Law "On the Free National Development of USSR Citizens Residing Outside Their National-State Formations or Not Having Such Formations on USSR Territory."

A. Lukyanov, Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Moscow, the Kremlin, 26 April 1990.

Latsis Comments on Party Issues

PM0506090390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 90 pp 1-2

[Report by B. Minayev and S. Sokolov on phone-in with Otto Latsis, deputy chief editor of the journal KOMMUNIST: "'Don't Let Yourself Be Deceived'"—date and place of phone-in not specified; first paragraph is introduction]

[Excerpts] Otto Rudolfovich Latsis, deputy chief editor of the journal KOMMUNIST holds a consultation today for seniors preparing for social science examinations. [passage omitted]

Who Is To Blame?

[KP] What do you think, is the Communist Party responsible for what is happening in our country?

[Latsis] It is the ruling party, of course it is responsible.

[KP] Then should its past and present leaders be punished for this? (Sergey Kostin, Moscow)

[Latsis] Well, you can't punish yesterday's leaders, they are dead. And anyway, punishment is an individual thing. How can the people who are correcting the mistakes be responsible for them?

[KP] But shouldn't Gorbachev, for instance, acknowledge his mistakes? After all, five years ago he was saying something completely different.

[Latsis] The life of even one man is unpredictable, so what about the common fate of 280 million people? Gorbachev was not deceiving you five years ago—that was how he thought at the time.

[KP] If Lenin had lived longer, would he have reexamined his viewpoint on Marxian socialism?

[Latsis] Lenin reexamined much in Marx' theories even while he was alive: In particular, in 1921 he put forward new ideas in the sphere of commodity-money relations. In this year's issue No. 5 of KOMMUNIST, I wrote about whether Lenin had a "second New Economic Policy plan." Today we are trying to understand just what lies behind the phrase that we cite so often: "To reexamine our whole viewpoint on socialism." In the article I tried to substantiate my understanding of the new plan for the structure of the socialist economy which Lenin was forming.

[KP] What do you think about the opinion that Lenin was to blame for all the subsequent repressions, was their ideological founding father, so to speak?

[Latsis] The use of violence against violence in civil war conditions—that is, what Lenin himself put an end to in 1921—is one thing. The repressions unleashed by Stalin in a peaceful developing country eight years after the civil war are another. Stalin's basic idea—a fateful, crazy idea—that the class struggle sharpens as a country advances toward socialism is completely anti-Leninist. This difference in the formulation of the question has to be understood. Did Lenin use violence? Of course he did. The violence and repressions of the civil war epoch are common knowledge. Whether he was the founding father of Stalin's violence is a completely different question. After all, Lenin took power in a country which was completely enveloped by violence. And the first thing that Lenin did was to free millions of people from violence. A step like the Brest Peace was without parallel in world history. Russia withdrew from the war unilaterally! This was Lenin's most direct concrete implementation of nonviolence. And when his nonviolence was answered with fresh violence, the response was the defense of the revolution and the country. Any state uses violence. But to say that Lenin used it in Stalin's way is untrue. [passage omitted]

[KP] What is your view of Bukharin?

[Latsis] He is a very contradictory figure. Bukharin the "left-wing communist" of the period of the Brest Peace was certainly mistaken and was quite rightly critized by Lenin. Bukharin the "right-wing deviationist" was no deviationist at all, but a consistent Leninist, speaking out against the Stalin group's leftist views on the economy. But, most unfortunately, the party chose in Stalin's favor. What is the historical value of today's discussion about Bukharin? After all, he is a thing of the past, so to speak. The value is that there was, it transpires, an alternative to Stalinism. Theoretically Bukharin's views and his criticism of Stalin's plan for industrialization and collectivization constitute a genuine alternative to Stalinism, a genuine continuation of Lenin's views on socialism at the period when he drew up his political testament. This is what it is important for us to know today when we discuss whether or not Stalinism was inevitable and why it arose.

[KP] Was there an alternative to socialism in our country? (Ye. Kryukova, Tashkent)

[Latsis] Do you mean: Was there an alternative to October? Hardly, I think. I have already answered this question in reply to a young man: There were no other political parties which would take on the responsibility and boldness to resolve tasks which were of cardinal importance to the people—withdrawal from the war and the land issue. Therefore it is unhistorical to conjecture about whether Russia had a chance of resolving these vital pan-human problems in some other way—without the party which led the people to socialism, and without violence. [passage omitted]

[KP] What is your assessment of the analysis of historical events in A.I. Solzhenitsyn's novel "The Gulag Archipelago"?

[Latsis] I can list plenty of factual mistakes and inaccuracies and note the biased interpretation of facts. For instance, I was very troubled by the claim that none of the Bolsheviks (with the sole exception of Dzerzhinskiy) really went to prison. And that all the repressions fell only upon the heads of the Mensheviks, Socialist Revolutionaries, and anarchists. After all, you only have to recall Rudzutak, who spent 10 years in prison, to refute this categorical claim. Bolsheviks suffered hard labor, execution, and the firing squad just like all revolutionaries.

These specific inaccuracies, of course, do not nullify the novel. Solzhenitsyn, in my view, should be seen as a very great writer, an artist who told the terrible truth about what he saw. But in cases where he assesses historical documents to which we have just as much access, we are entitled to see this as one of many viewpoints which, like other analyses, is open to dispute and verification.

Will the CPSU Remain In Power?

[KP] Will the party's leading role be preserved? (Ye. Tsavlova, Kurgan Oblast)

[Latsis] The party itself has abandoned its automatic hold on power and its role as bureaucratized leading

force and is fighting for the role of society's political vanguard. That is how the task has been set since the 19th party conference. And it must be resolved by political means. Explanation, agitation, the putting forward of an action program that will convince the people that this party should be supported, election campaigning—all within the framework of the constitution. I think that the party will retain a leading position among the political forces in society for two reasons. First, there is simply no other organizing social force, and society badly needs one. And second, a long with a large number of party conservatives, there are people in the party capable of doing such work. [passage omitted]

[KP] And what do you yourself think of the Communist Party today?

[Latsis] It is going through a very grave crisis, but is today the only real organizing social and political force capable of extricating both itself and society from the crisis.

[KP] Won't a multiparty system lead to anarchy? (L. Biryukov)

[Latsis] In general, a normal civilized multiparty system helps the establishment of democratic order, not of anarchy. It offers the possibility of additional public control over the state apparatus. After all, the state apparatus by its very nature tends toward bureaucratism—this can be said to be its occupational hazard. Lenin said that it impossible to destroy bureaucratism at a stroke, it can be reduced only by sustained effort. This is why we need organized social criticism, and a multiparty system is very useful in this respect.... That is, if we have a civilized multiparty system; if we have a different kind—with shouting at rallies, with jockeying for position, with the principal aim of showing how bold and clever you are—this, of course, will facilitate anarchy.

[KP] Is communist ideology to blame for what has happened to our country?

[Latsis] The vulgarization of ideology is to blame, speculation on communist ideology is to blame. People called themselves communists when in fact they were enemies and destroyers of communism. Communists like Stalin and his henchmen killed more communists than any fascists ever did.

The idea of communism, as an ideal of social equality which mankind has nurtured over the centuries, the communism which Marx and Lenin created, is not to blame. After all, we do not blame Christ for what the inquisitors did in his name. Those were the ideas of the inquisition, not those of Christianity. communist ideology is not to blame for the distortions of the communist ideal. [passage omitted]

Two New Parties Present Platforms

LD0206161290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1135 GMT on 2 June carries a 30-minute "Gallery" program presented from a cooperative cafe by Olga Krivosheywva and Oleg Vakulovskiy. The program comprises separate features on two new parties, the Free Labor Party [partiya svobodnogo truda] and the United Workers' Front [obyedinennyy front trudyashchikhsya], and is based on interviews with their activists, who talk in general terms about their parties' views and priorities.

The Free Labor Party, representing the interests of cooperatives, is represented by Artem Tarasov, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputy and vice president of the USSR Union of United Cooperatives; Yuriy Vorontsov, vice president of the USSR Union of United Cooperatives and member of the consultative committee for the creation of the party; Valeriy Pisigin, president of the USSR Interregional Cooperative Federation; and Eduard Averbakh, member of the consultative committee for the creation of the party.

The United Workers' Front, proclaiming itself in favor of Marxism-Leninism without distortions, sets out its position in an interview with Vladimir Stradymov, member of the coordinating council of the Moscow United Workers Front and Professor Aleksey Sergeyev, a doctor of economic sciences and a front activist. Igor Malyarov, a member of the coordinating council of the Moscow Front is shown addressing a public meeting on the party's aims. Viktor Anpilov, a Mossovet [Moscow City Soviet] deputy and front activist, is filmed arguing with passers-by at a front picket line outside the "Serp i Molot" works in Moscow.

Legislation Urges Caucasus Refugee Solution

LD2905143390 Moscow TASS in English 1030 GMT 29 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Kirill Dibrova]

[Text] Moscow, May 29 TASS—Over a billion roubles were spend to help refugees who fled from Transcaucasia in January alone. Their provision with dwellings and employment in other regions of the country will take much more money, chairman of the coordination committee for refugee issues at the USSR State Committee for Labour and Social Issues Petr Rudev told TASS.

He noted that the refugee problem is now in the Soviet Union. The country faced it recently after interethnic tension increased in some regions. There are some 600,000 refugees in the Soviet Union today—mainly Armenians, Azerbaijanis, Meskhetian Turks and Russians who were forced to leave their residences after interethnic conflicts in Transcaucasia and Central Asia.

The government renders all possible assistance to refugees but it cannot resolve these problems quickly. Although the majority of refugees are placed in rest

houses near Moscow and some other regions of Russia and the Ukraine and provided with basic necessities, their permanent resettlement in new places and new employment are serious problems.

Considerable money is allocated to help refugees. They are paid allowances of 300 to 450 roubles per person and the cost of their abandoned property.

In addition to the financial side of the problem, there exists a legal side. There is no concept of "refugee" in Soviet legislation.

"Any person, no matter why he leaves his residence, may declare himself a refugee and demand a compensation for losses from the government. It is necessary to adopt a special law determining refugee status and ensuring state guarantees for such people as quickly as possible," Rudev said. He said he hoped that the Soviet parliament will adopt such a law this year.

Centrist-Radical Bloc Unites on 'Consensus' Terms

PM1106115190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Jun 90 Single Edition p 8

[TASS report: "Bloc of Parties"]

[Text] Moscow, 9 Jun—A meeting was held in the Soviet Peace Defense Committee auditorium in the capital yesterday at which a centrist moderate-radical bloc of political parties and movements was formed. V. Zhirinovskiy, chairman of the Soviet Union's Liberal Democratic Party, and A. Brumel, leader of the radical faction of the Moscow People's Front, acted as the initiators of the establishment of this coalition.

The bloc comprises as its main members the Liberal Democratic Party, the Russian Democratic Forum, the radical faction of the Moscow People's Front, G. Kasparov's faction in the Democratic Party of Russia, the Union of Democratic Forces named for Sakharov, and the Soviet-American Integration Association, and as observers the Russian Democratic Party, the Urban and Rural Proprietors Party, and the Constitutional Democratic Party.

"The pooling of efforts in the radical restructuring of society's life and reorganization of the state, the creation of an alliance of centrist forces to prevent the influence of extreme left-wing and extreme right-wing groupings in political life, and preparations for future election campaigns" were declared the bloc's main objectives.

The leadership of the bloc is in the hands of representatives of the main members on a consensus basis proceeding from the full independence of all the coalition members.

The meeting also defined the main political principles which will govern the bloc's activities—"achievement of goals solely within the framework of humane laws, excluding violence and banning actions aimed at inciting political, ethnic, religious, and social strife. The coalition participants advocate strict observance of the principle "human rights for every individual."

State Commission Discusses Soviet Germans

WA0606191690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "In the State Commission for the Problems of Soviet Germans"]

[Text] The state commission heard the report of K.S. Omerbayeva, deputy chairman of the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, which dealt with the work conducted in the republic with the purpose of resolving the problems of nearly a million Soviet Germans living there, to preserve and develop their traditions, culture, and language, and to enhance their political and social activity. Over 400 Soviet Germans have been nominated for administrative positions in the party and soviet organs; 169 Germans are sovkhoz [state farm] directors, every 10th kolkhoz [collective farm] is headed by a German. Five Germans were elected USSR people's deputies, 10 were elected to the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet, and 8,708 Germans were elected to local soviets of people's deputies. German language TV and radio broadcasts are aired weekly for Soviet Germans, and they also publish the FREUNDSCHAFT newspaper.

The commission requested that the USSR State Committee for Public Education, the USSR State Committee for the Press, the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, and the USSR Ministry of Culture extend the necessary help to the Kazakh SSR so the republic can increase the volume of books published there, both fiction and educational, produce more TV and radio broadcasts in German, and educate ethnic cadres of teachers, journalists, and culture workers. The Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers is requested to contribute in all ways to the constructive activity of the republic organization "Vozrozhdeniye," the all-union society of Soviet Germans. They are also expected to resolve the problem of constructing a republican German cultural center and to expedite the preparation and adoption of a complex program aimed at developing ethnic German culture, language, and traditions. They are asked to research the possibility of forming ethnic rayons and village soviets in locations with a dense German population.

The commission discussed the complex program designed by the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, the USSR Ministry of Culture, and the USSR State Committee for Public Education with the view of providing for the needs of Soviet Germans in the field of education and the training of ethnic German specialists. The program includes the creation of ethnic schools and preschool groups and special and higher education institutions; it outlines the preparation of the curricula, textbooks, and instruction manuals for them, as well as teacher training; it also suggests sending groups

of young Germans to study in the educational establishments of German-speaking countries. It has been suggested that German schools be opened starting this year in the areas with dense German population as well as forming groups of students in universities which will study their subjects in their native language.

The commission heard information on progress in preparing proposals on the status of labor army members and on the repeal of all acts of legislation limiting the rights of Soviet Germans. It also heard about the preparation of the congress of Soviet Germans.

The session was led by the chairman of the state commission, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers V.K. Gusev.

Leningrad Official Fears Social Unrest

AU1106112890 Hamburg WELT AM SONNTAG in German 10 Jun 90 pp 28-29

[Interview with Boris Venyaminovich Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad Oblast Party Committee and Supreme Soviet Deputy, by Jochen Kummer in Leningrad; date not given: "It Is To Be Feared That Social Unrest Will Spread and Get Out of Control"]

[Text] [Kummer] Soviet economic Professor Viktor D. Belkin told WELT AM SONNTAG that 40 to 50 million of the about 287 million people in the Soviet Union are starving—about one out of six. Has the economic situation in the Soviet Union deteriorated so dramatically that a famine is imminent?

[Gidaspov] It is correct that 40 to 50 million people live below subsistence level in our country, thus in conditions unworthy of human beings. These people include old people, pensioners, and also students. But there is not the danger of starving to death.

[Kummer] Will there be social unrest?

[Gidaspov] There is already unrest, the national conflicts, for instance,a and the strikes of the coal miners last summer. They are caused by economic problems. It is to be feared that social unrest will spread and get out of control. Therefore, it is one of the main tasks of the government to keep the unrest under control. The trust in the government is not unlimited.

[Kummer] Leningrad Professor Aleksandr A. Fursenko says that Gorbachev and the Soviet Government have only two years left to appease the people by means of economic successes.

[Gidaspov] I would not set down an exact number of years. The Russian people are patient. However, we must achieve tangible economic successes within two to four years.

[Kummer] I have seen long lines in front of the sops everywhere. What is the reason for the deterioration, do you think?

[Gidaspov] The lines are the result of the behavior of our Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov. In a recent speech he spoke about the changes in prices. He announced that the prices for bread and flour products are to be tripled soon. Now the people are panicking and are buying all bread products, flour, spaghetti, barley. There are enough foodstuffs in the city. But because of the panic people are buying three times the usual amounts every day.

[Kummer] But there is a lack of everything. One cannot buy any furniture, hardly any household appliances and shoes, rarely fruit and vegetables—and those horrendous prices.

[Gidaspov] The difficult situation of our economy is no secret any more. There are forces that are struggling against President Gorbachev's new economic policy; they include employees in the ministries who fear losing their monopoly. One reason also is—and this is my personal opinion—that the cooperatives have now preferential treatment over state enterprises. The cooperatives, which simply buy and sell, deserve criticism: For instance, they buy grapes in central Asia and sell them in Leningrad at several times their original price—which brings them gigantic profits.

[Kummer] You are a powerful man in Leningrad Oblast. Why do you not change anything about supply?

[Gidaspov] We have taken our own measures for Leningrad, for instance in order to safeguard the supply of grapes. We have concluded a contract with Uzbekistan, according to which Uzbekistan will deliver fruit and vegetables in return for technical products from the Leningrad oblast. Over the past days such a contract was also concluded with Azerbaijan. In addition, we are intensifying the long-standing relations with the city of Astrakhan at the Volga delta on the Caspian Sea, which is famous for its beautiful tomatoes and big water melons.

[Kummer] This concerns fruit and vegetables. How do you want to achieve quick successes concerning consumer goods?

[Gidaspov] We are linking great expectations with the conversion of the military industry. Enterprises which produced sputniks or artillery guns in the past are being converted for peaceful production for agriculture, household appliances, or baby carriages and children's beds. But Leningrad cannot separate itself entirely from the economy in the entire country. We do not have financial sovereignty; the finances are being administered by the center in Moscow. Another step has already been initiated. Our slogan is: Land back to the peasants.

[Kummer] For free or by selling it to them?

[Gidaspov] The peasants will get it from the government for free; land is to be privatized for the peasants. However, during my trips through Leningrad Oblast I talked

to peasants and I have not found more than 20 or 30 whoa are immediately willing to take over land as private property.

[Kummer] Seventy years of the socialist system have destroyed any private initiative.

[Gidaspov] Now we are trying to revive these qualities again. One also has to take into account the fact that the people are accustomed to working eight hours a day. But cows have to be milked at 0500 in the morning for the first time.... I am for state property, cooperative property, lease hold, and private property.

[Kummer] You have the reputation of being a manager who has built up a successful Soviet chemical concern. Do you see this as a model for the industry of your country?

[Gidaspov] The concern's structure is similar to that of your Hoechst concern. The most important step was that I made it independent of four ministries and that it works. We even had our own bank. Now there are 600 such concerns in our country; they work better than many state enterprises.

[Kummer] What do you say about Boris Yeltsin's election as president of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic?

[Gidaspov] I respect it as the decision of the majority of deputies.

[Kummer] But Gorbachev tried to prevent Yeltsin's election.

[Gidaspov] Yeltsin and Gorbachev advocate a common basic thought in policy, that of socialism. In many talks with the two men I noted that they agree in most political questions. Only, Yeltsin wants to implement the transformation within a briefer period, wants a quicker implementation of reforms, and a more radical speed.

[Kummer] Is speed not the most important thing today?

[Gidaspov] I agree that it is the most important thing at the moment. But the economy cannot be restructured too quickly.

[Kummer] Which side are you on: that of Gorbachev or that of Yeltsin?

[Gidaspov] If both are clever—and I think that they are—they have to make concessions to each other. Yeltsin has already taken such a step by stating in an interview that he is frankly for cooperation. Now it is Gorbachev's turn. Bismarck once said: 'If you cannot defeat your enemy, you have to embrace him....' Gorbachev's program makes more impression on me than that of Yeltsin.

[Kummer] What would you accept from Yeltsin's program?

[Gidaspov] He proposes the definite change toward a pluralist economy. I am also in favor of this.

[Kummer] Will the Soviet Union develop from a one-party state to a multiparty system?

[Gidaspov] This is a historical necessity.

In conclusion of our interview I would like to address a few words to your country. We have one request to make of the Germans: Help us with your high technology and also deliver consumer goods to us—but do it quickly!

Abalkin Rejects Polish Economic Methods

LD2905091390 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 29 May 90

[Text] Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin has rejected the Polish version of transition to a market-oriented economy, which led to greater social tension in that country. Had we chosen the Polish road our government would have had to resign in about six months, he said. In an interview for the press, Abalkin defended the concept of gradual transition to a market-oriented economy with the implementation of measures designed to protect the people against higher prices and inflation. However, even this concept has come under fire at the Supreme Soviet. According to MPs, the government will not be able to pay compensation as the economic crisis deepens.

Komsomol Concerns on Market Economy Voiced

PM0806112390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jun 90 p 1

[Unattributed report on session of Komsomol Central Committee Bureau followed by unattributed interview with Vladimir Zyukin, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, under general heading "In the Komsomol Central Committee Bureau"—date, place of interview not specified]

[Text] The Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee Bureau has examined proposals in connection with the discussion in the USSR Supreme Soviet of the concept of the transition to a regulated market economy.

The decision adopted notes that the Central Committee Bureau supports the transformation of the country's economy on the basis of market relations. However, it believes that the concept proposed by the USSR Government does not contain an entire package of measures to ensure a specific and socially safe procedure for forming the market mechanism.

Concern is elicited by the insufficient elaboration of measures for the social protection of low-income strata of the population—including tax concessions—which include virtually all young workers and students as well as pensioners and invalids.

In addition, the government is not taking into account the specific nature of the socioeconomic problems which arise for young people in market conditions.

In view of the fact that the younger generation has more interest than anyone in the adoption of a well thought-out and effective concept of the transition to a regulated market economy making it possible to extricate the country from its economic impasse, since it will not only have to participate in the realization of this concept but also have to "reap its fruits," whatever they turn out to be, the Komsomol Central Committee Bureau considers it necessary:

1. To invite youth organizations, associations, and movements and initiative groups of young scientists and specialists which have positive ideas and alternative plans for economic reform to participate in joint work. Using the Komsomol's representatives in the country's parliament, to tell the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform to make a careful study of proposals and alternative concepts for the perestroyka of the economy and submit them for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet session along with the USSR Government's proposals.

2. To put to the USSR Government a proposal that it further study the package of proposals for ensuring work for young people, including: the introduction of tax concessions stimulating the hiring of young people at nonstate enterprises; guarantees of a first job for all young people; the stimulation of youth enterprise; the creation of a system for improving the qualifications of young workers and for retraining them; the granting of credits to young citizens and young families; and the creation of a state social service for young people.

Commentary by Vladimir Zyukin, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] What prompted the appearance of this, the second Komsomol Central Committee Bureau decision in a short time, the first being about a number of draft laws being discussed in the USSR Supreme Soviet and this one being about the government's program?

[Zyukin] It was prompted by the fact that the Komsomol, as a sociopolitical organization, cannot be silent about highly important state decisions and laws which may have a fundamental influence on the situation in the country and will affect the younger generation most strongly of all.

First of all it seems to us that the proposed package of measures is insufficient for a transition to a full-fledged market and in a number of cases camouflages the command functions of the administrative system. The program does not sufficiently ensure a procedure for moving toward the market which is safe for society and its individual social groups.

We cannot but be worried at the consequences of the transitional period that will affect young people. The system of social guarantees in the draft reform does not envision a solution to the problem of preventing youth unemployment and creating a system of vocational training and job placement for young people, guarantees of a realistic living wage, the granting of credits to young citizens and young families, youth enterprise, or the creation of strong starting conditions for young people's rapid social development in market economy conditions.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Criticism is useful in itself. But can the Komsomol suggest any constructive ideas of its own?

[Zyukin] Yes, we are preparing concrete proposals on particular aspects of the economic reform, but to present an integrated concept or even a program for reform is, strictly speaking, not the job of a youth sociopolitical organization. Today our deputies in parliament are doing some original work on the reform of money circulation on the basis of internal convertibility of the ruble. Our scientists have also prepared and passed to the government an additional social package for the USSR law "On the General Principles of State Youth Policy in the USSR" which proposes a system of measures to ensure youth employment, support youth enterprise, and provide credit and material aid to young people and elaborates a system for a public and state social service for youth affairs. This package of norms was supported by a number of Supreme Soviet committees and commissions and by individual deputies when the draft law was examined 9 April this year.

We believe that the qualitative transformation of the economy is impossible in our conditions without creating the conditions for the extensive development of entrepreneurial activity, and youth entrepeneurial activity above all. Especially as such experience exists in world practice and has already produced positive results.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] What do you expect from the decision adopted by the Bureau?

[Zyukin] We are hoping for a response from young people, and we expect to receive proposals from young economists and entrepreneurs on the transition to the market economy and to help young, unorthodox scientists and specialists with their own views on the economic transformation of the country to communicate their ideas to the Supreme Soviet.

We are using our representatives in the USSR Supreme Soviet to pass on the proposals we have prepared to the Committee for Economic Reform and to press for their examination on an equal footing with other projects.

And there is more. Our appeal to the Committee for Youth Affairs proposing that we hear the government's position on questions of specific youth problems in market conditions should initiate the elaboration of the necessary pre-emptive measures.

Akhromeyev Views Changing Attitudes to Army

PM0506083690 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 1 Jun 90 p 2

[Interview with Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev by Ezio Mauro in Washington on 31 May]

[Text] Washington—"If the West believes it is dealing with a weakened Gorbachev at the summit table, it is mistaken. The USSR is, and remains, a great superpower, even though difficulties are not lacking and they do influence East-West negotiations to some extent."

Sergey Akhromeyev, marshal of the USSR and military adviser to Gorbachev was surrounded by Soviet officials who jumped to attention as he passed by on his way from the hotel to the U.S.-USSR negotiating table at the White House. A supporter of Gorbachev and perestroyka, in recent months Akhromeyev has become the champion of the Soviet military-industrial system, and is under attack from the radicals and even the reformists for having become the defender of the Red Army's role and function within the changing Soviet regime and for becoming the interpreter of the troops' anxieties and the commands' protests—their representative within the country's leadership. This is what Akhromeyev told LA REPUBBLICA as the negotiations on strategic arms reductions and the European security system—which directly involves the Soviet Armed Forces' role—were starting.

[Mauro] Marshal, what is the military command's response to the Washington negotiations? Following the revolution in East Europe, and in the midst of the Soviet domestic crisis, are the Armed Forces afraid that the USSR's negotiating strength has declined and that this will become the first summit between two unequal superpowers?

[Akhromeyev] We do not believe that the USSR has abdicated its superpower role, though we can see very clearly the problems facing the country and we do not underestimate them at all. But, all in all, we believe that the negotiations with the United States are still influenced more by the positive factors of change than by the negative ones. This, because it must not be forgotten that in the past five years the USSR has become a different country, and this has altered relations with the United States. A new system of trust has been built, which seems solid to me and capable of surviving passing difficulties.

[Mauro] So do the USSR and its military system not feel weakened, now that Gorbachev is entering the White House having lost his empire?

[Akhromeyev] No, I do not have this impression. I feel alarmed by the very critical situation being created in my country, but not by anything else: This is what worries me. But at the same time I believe in my people and in their ability to tackle the difficulties, so I am sure that we will succeed.

[Mauro] Could the internal difficulties that you mention—from the national revolts to the economic crisis and Yeltsin's election as Russia's leader—have a negative impact on Gorbachev in his negotiations with President Bush?

[Akhromeyev] I do not believe that Yeltsin's election is such a major problem as to cast a shadow over the summit: I really do not believe that it can alter the situation. But, having said that, I do not deny that our internal problems do threaten to create some difficulties in the negotiations with the Americans. Such repercussions are probably inevitable. Nevertheless there is something that must never be forgotten: The foundation on which the USSR's strength and power have always rested consists of a nation, a people, and their Armed Forces. This foundation remains intact, so that strength has not died, but remains alive.

[Mauro] What is the origin of the anxieties within the Red Army after five years of perestroyka, and where will they lead? What is the present status of relations between the Army, the people, and the government?

[Akhromeyev] Our people, taken as a whole, have always had great respect for the Armed Forces, which have defended the country, and still defend it. This link between the people and their army has become an element in the national character—something solid and historically consolidated that cannot be eliminated, as was shown by the celebrations of the 45th anniversary of the victory. But here too, alongside all this, there is an element of alarm, because in specific circles assessments and prejudices are being introduced that ultimately bring about a negative attitude to the Armed Forces. And there are even outright attacks, against which we must defend ourselves, because they are manifestations of a new and worrying lack of respect for the Army, which cannot fail to prompt alarm.

[Mauro] Is it true that the Army is resisting the change in its role and influence stemming from the new detente process?

[Akhromeyev] No: When military tension declines in the world we realize that a certain mentality must change and that the structure of the Armed Forces must change, too. But at the same time we do not forget that the threat of war still exists. So military preparations must still be maintained at the necessary level, and in the field of strategic nuclear weapons a balance must be maintained at all costs. It would be a very serious mistake not to do so.

[Mauro] But the Soviet military leaders, including Chief of Staff Moiseyev and the head of the Army's political department, Lizichev, have also attacked the political platform that the CPSU is presenting at the congress. The impression is that the Red Army is concealing tendencies contrary to the nascent multiparty system in the USSR after 70 years of Sovietization. Is this true?

[Akhromeyev] I believe that Moiseyev and Lizichev were right to say what they did and to express their anxieties. It is true, there are difficulties, which stem from the CPSU's loss of its leading role within Soviet society. This, because the emergence of parties will create problems for the political organization within the Army. Everything must be analyzed and dicussed before deciding.

[Mauro] What is meant, in the context of the present situation in the USSR, by Marshal Yazov's remark that the Army has defended the party and will continue to defend it?

[Akhromeyev] Today the antisocialist forces are attacking the Army because they know that it is their principal enemy, together with the party. Each one of us, from the leadership to the grassroots, swears to defend with the constitution also the socialist and soviet homeland. So I believe that Yazov is speaking the truth: As long as the Army remains monolithic the socialist system will be safe.

Lukyanov Attends Funeral of V.V. Kuznetsov

PM1106152590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "V.V. Kuznetsov Funeral"]

[Text] The funeral of V.V. Kuznetsov took place in Moscow 8 June.

The funeral hall contained wreaths from the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Council of Ministers, the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions], the USSR Foreign Ministry, and other organizations. Satin cushions held the awards for V.V. Kuznetsov's services to the Soviet state.

The following took their leave of V.V. Kuznetsov and participated in the funeral meeting: A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet; I.D. Laptev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union; USSR people's deputies; AUCCTU Secretary V.M. Mishin; A.G. Kovalev, USSR first deputy foreign minister; representatives of the Soviet public.

The burial took place at Novodevichye Cemetery.

Eminent Ethnographer Yu.V. Bromley Dies

PM0806150590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Second Edition p 8

[Obituary of Yu.V. Bromley]

[Excerpts] Academician Yulian Vladimirovich Bromley, eminent Soviet historian and ethnographer, member of the CPSU, and honorary director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Ethnography named for N.N. Miklukho-Maklay, died on 4 June 1990 after a serious illness. He was director of the Ethnography Institute from 1966 through 1989 and deputy chief academic secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium from 1976-1986, too. [passage omitted]
[Signed] V.P. Alekseyev, V.A. Vinogradov, A.S. Kapto, I.D. Kovalchenko, V.N. Kudryavtsev, Yu.S. Kukushkin, A.A. Logunov, N.M. Makarov, G.I. Marchuk, V.A. Medvedev, Yu.A. Osipyan, B.B. Piotrovskiy, Ye.M. Primakov, B.A. Rybakov, G.N. Sevostyanov, S.L. Tikhvinskiy, V.A. Tishkov, I.T. Frolov, S.S. Shatalin, and A.N. Yakovlev.

Leaders Sign Obituary of Retired Minister Lomako

PM0106101390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 May 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Obituary of Petr Fadeyevich Lomako]

[Excerpts] On 27 May 1990 Petr Fadeyevich Lomako, former USSR minister of nonferrous metallurgy, CPSU member since 192. and union personal pensioner, died aged 86 years.

P.F. Lomako was born in 1904 in the city of Temryuk, Krasnodar Kray. [passage omitted]

In 1957, after the reorganization of the management of industry, P.F. Lomako was assigned to work as chairman of the Krasnoyarsk Sovnarkhoz [Economic Council]. From 1962 he worked as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee]. With the formation of ministries in 1965, he was reappointed USSR minister of nonferrous metallurgy, where he worked for over 20 years. [passage omitted]
[Signed] N.I. Ryzhkov, Yu.D. Maslyukov, N.N. Slyunkov, L.A. Voronin, M.S. Shkabardnya, V.M. Velichko, V.A. Durasov, V.G. Kolesnikov, S.V. Kolpakov, N.S. Konarev, N.V. Lemayev, E.K. Pervyshin, V.I. Reshetilov, A.S. Systsov, M.I. Shchadov, I.I. Kostyukov, V.V.Rudakov, V.S. Ustinov.

Economic

Parliamentary Debate on Economic Reform Postponed

AU1206121790 Paris AFP in English 1209 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 12 (AFP)—The Soviet parliament has postponed debate on a controversial economic reform package, due to be held Tuesday, the Radio Moscow publication INTERFAX said Tuesday.

INTERFAX quoted Leonid Abalkin, the deputy prime minister responsible for the reforms to introduce a regulated market economy, as saying the debate would now be held Wednesday.

The reform programme, details of which were unveiled three weeks ago by Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzkhov, has come under strong criticism from many deputies and led to disagreements within the Soviet leadership.

President Mikhail Gorbachev on Tuesday sought to calm fears in replies to questions from parliamentarians.

"We will do everything to preserve the current standard of living," he said. "The government will help the most disadvantaged."

The government had previously warned that the reform package would mean a five to six per cent fall in the standard of living.

But Mr. Gorbachev warned that "you must not think that the transition (to a market economy) will go through unnoticed, it will be painful in any case because the economy is going through a crisis."

"Anyone who thinks that the transition will not be painful understands nothing about the laws of economics," he added, in a clear reference to Boris Yeltsin, President of the Russian Federation, who said Saturday that he had a 500-day plan for the economy which "would not affect people's lives."

Yarin Press Conference on Reforms Reported

WA0806191690 Moscow TRUD in Russian 6 Jun 90 p 1

[TRUD political observer V. Golovachev report: "Are We Ready for the Market?"]

[Text] The fate of a major turnabout in our life—the transition to controlled market relations—will depend primarily on whether the concept proposed by the government is approved by the majority of the population or ... Particular significance is attached to the position of the workers and laborers of the countryside—their say could prove decisive. This is why the "Economic Reform and the Controlled Market From the Viewpoint of Deputies Who Work in Production" press conference held yesterday in the Kremlin evoked great interest. The following USSR people's deputies participated: V.A. Yarin, member of the Presidential Council; driver L.I. Sukhov; excavator operator T.K. Pupkevich; and Yu.K. Sharipov, general director of a science-production association.

All were united by serious concern as to the consequences that transition to a controlled market would bring about and whether Soviet people's necessary social protection would be provided for. At the same time it was emphasized that we could no longer live in the old way.

"It has to be understood," V. Yarin stressed, "that there is no going back. But everyone must bear his share of responsibility. It is essential that resolve we upon the step precisely toward the market."

The member of the Presidential Council said that he was very anxious about the shock that would be caused among the workers by the impending transition to controlled market relations. People have no idea what a controlled market is and what it could do for the population. "I, an iron and steel worker for 30 years, have all my personal belongings on me," Veniamin Aleksandrovich said, indicating his suit.

"Would it not have been advisable for the Presidential Council to have created an alternative economic recovery program?" a journalist asked.

"This would, most likely, have made sense, in my view," V. Yarin replied. "We would like altogether to bring together young scientists, enthusiasts, and people who think in a way that is out of the ordinary in order that they might devise crazy ideas, as they say, and alternative projects. This would, I believe, be beneficial...."

"But are the workers prepared to take over the property about which there is today so much argument?"

"About 70 percent of my colleagues, drivers," L. Sukhov answered, "are not in my view capable of taking over property. I would like to draw the following analogy. If one person is an athlete, an acrobat, and another has never performed any exercises, no powers could force the second to emulate circus stunts. We will not by such a bound jump over to the market. Would that I were wrong, of course...."

"The majority of work outfits does not fully understand what a market economy means," T. Pupkevich continued the conversation. If lack of personal responsibility is eliminated here and initiative is emancipated, people will, I believe, support this system, whatever it is called. But if it is a question of unemployment and a lowering of the living standard, the majority will be against."

A very important thought was expressed by Yu. Sharipov. He emphasized that the issue today is not one of switching to the market or not. The question is: When and how to switch to a controlled market, how will this be reflected in people's living standard, and in whose hands (those of the shadow economy or the working people) property will end up upon its denationalization. And before conducting a referendum, say, a great deal of explanatory work is needed. It is essential to show to people intelligibly what the market means. So much universal economic education was conducted in former years, but none of this had much in common with economic training. It is necessary to awaken interest in the population in economic life, initiative, creative work....

This is, indeed, surely a most important task today. In order to speak on some subject it is necessary to have some idea about it. And about market relations, which over decades of ideological indoctrination have been associated in many people's minds with the "plagues of capitalism," even more....

Economists Set Out Views on Reform

LD0906230190 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 7 Jun 90

[From the "Soviet Panorama" program]

[Text] Economic reform in the Soviet Union has reached its peak. A member of the Presidential Council, Dr. Stanislav Shatalin, has said this country is no less than (?13) months behind schedule in its shift toward a market economy. We present a number of alternative views by Soviet economists on the forms and methods of transition to a new system of management based on economic methods.

At present virtually all Soviet economists agree that the administrative economic system has exhausted its potential. Some believe, however, that the issue of reforming that system should be approached with care. Dr. (Arkadiy Ivanov) is a proponent of such careful approach. He maintains that the administration by command, although generating economic imbalances, was capable of regulating them. Hence his belief that the Soviet Union needs to follow nobody's example but use its own organizational and planning experience acquired over the years of its national development. According to Dr. (Ivanov), the recent attempts to introduce market practices have shown the complex and contradictory character of Soviet reforms and the evident trend of shifting from the collective interests of manufacturers toward group egoism, thereby the economic independence of separate regions of the USSR has been assuming the form of economic and also political extremism. Under the circumstances, Dr. (Ivanov) predicts, the Soviet economy may be increasingly unstable and granting independence to all participants in the production process may lead the nation into a deadlock. Hence, he argues, transition from planned administration to market practices should be gradual and based on caution and compromise.

Dr. (Vasiliy Silunin), one of the most radically minded economists, holds an opposite view. He suggests an immediate shift to market relations involving Polish-style shock treatment. Dr. (Silunin) won worldwide recognition by publising a series of highly controversial articles in the Soviet press. He is an opponent of half-measures and believes that only an [word indistinct] market system can balance out our economy. Reform, he says, is the only promising chance in the long-term prospectus. Mr. (Silunin) rejects the term "planned market economy", since planning and market practices are, in his view, incompatible. To pull the country out of the present crisis, the economist says, it is necessary to take a set of extremely unpopular decisions, free the prices, and create and a money deficit. Private property, according to Dr. (Silunin), must be allowed in all forms. He admits that economic restructuring may cause unemployment rates to increase and living standards to continue declining for some time. But after two or three years of instability, he insists, the national economy will become much healthier. Dr. (Silunin) maintains that the people no longer have confidence in the national government. He favors the formation of a coalition government which would be ready to launch a set of economic reforms and replace party control with state control. He says that the proposed program of effective economic reforms can be seen through by such economists as Gavriil Popov, Nikolay Shmelev, Vladimir Tikhonov, Otto Latsis, Oleg Bogomolov, and Stanislav Shatalin.

Presidential Council member Dr. Shatalin does not necessarily share the opinion of the majority. He is close to the radical wing, although his is a more balanced position. He believes that shifting toward a market economy can be less risky than marking time. Nevertheless, he maintains that it wold be impossible to create an essentially new economy over two or three years without considerable losses. Nor would it be possible to immediately introduce market relations proper as the radicals, among them Dr. (Silunin), have suggesed. Dr. Shatalin says what is needed is a period of thorough preparations and a clever market infrastructure. Hence the need for government influence on the Soviet market to be much stronger than in other countries which have taken centuries to create market economies of their own. If the national economy is ever to be stabilized, Dr. Shatalin says, priority attention should be given to large-scale cooperation in all forms with the West. The country, he argues, would need direct foreign investment in domestic projects in addition to the organization of joint ventures. He suggests his own program for leading the country out of the deadlock. It envisages a large-scale conversion program, drastic cuts in military spending, normal working conditions for cooperatives and further cut backs on industrial construction. Besides, it would be necessary, according to Dr. Shatalin, to launch a pricing reform and control mounting monetary [word indistinct]. This, in the economist's opinion, can add dynamism to national economic performance.

Economists Discuss Economic Reform Issues

LD1206115990 Moscow World Service in English 0710 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] [Announcer] One of the hot topics in this country is the market economy. The national parliament is having before it the government program. But leading economists have suggested alternatives. According to the economist and member of parliament [MP] Nikolay Shmelev the first step toward a market economy must be privatizing ownership.

[Begin Shmelev recording in Russian fading to English translation] A market is impossible without freedom of enterprise and without removing all administrative systems, including ministries. The public sector must enjoy freedom of enterprise and adopt either shareholding or lease for their purpose. And the cooperative and individual sectors must enjoy the same freedom. A private sector, in a classical sense of the word, is permissible. Private enterprises hiring up to 100 workers are one more possibility. Everything on top of this ceiling must be transformed into a joint stock company. [end recording]

[Announcer] Dr. Shmelev also believes that if there are to be market relations the consumer market must be saturated with the help of western credits and (?import).

[Begin Shmelev recording] I can't believe people will put up with higher retail prices or agree to lose some of their incomes if shop counters remain empty. [end recording]

[Announcer] Another leading economist and MP, Gennadiy Lisichkin, believes a market can't do without free prices. He believes pensioners, invalids, and college students must have pensions and allowances and workers must be paid more. And he believes that key condition for transition to market is redistributing the national income in favour of retail trade.

[Begin Lisichkin recording in Russian, fading to English translation] Let's see how this country uses its income. Even now it backs retail trade with only 75 percent of the national income, whereas the United States with 82 percent and West Germany 88 [sentence as heard]. This country has the world's cheapest labor. If it wants to build a market economy on cheap labor it is going to abort the whole of this transition. I believe a reform and radicalization must begin with the people. If this country ignores people and their private and collective interests, all its market economy ambitions are doomed to failure. [end recording]

[Announcer] Those were two opinions about transition to a market economy.

Miners, Officials on Ways To Avert Strikes

904F0173A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 1 Jun 90 pp 1, 2

[Roundtable discussion with miners; Lev Ryabev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Council of Ministers Bureau for the Fuel and Energy Complex; and Minister of the Coal Industry Mikhail Shchadov; moderated by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent Aleksandr Krotkov: "A Difficult Science of Trust"]

[Text] **The situation in the coal-mining areas of our country is becoming hot. The strike committees of the Kuzbass are in operation again. The Donbass is holding rallies. Karaganda voted against a strike with a razor-thin margin of one vote. What is going to happen tomorrow?... The following miners, members of the state-public commission for monitoring the execution of USSR Council of Ministers Resolution No. 608 (adopted as a result of demands made by the strikers last year) took part in our conversation: Mikhail Krylov, drifter at the Oktyabrskaya Mine (Donetsk); Mikhail Kundruytskiy, operator of mining equipment at the Voroshilovgradskaya-1 Mine (Lugansk); Victor Lomin, drifter at the Zyryanovskaya Mine (Novokuznetsk). The government was represented by Lev Ryabev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Council of Ministers Bureau for the Fuel and Energy Complex, and Minister of the Coal Industry Mikhail Shchadov. RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent Aleksandr Krotkov moderated.**

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] We think that at present nobody has a guarantee that a tragic accident will not happen such as the recent mass poisoning in the mines of Gorlovka and Yenakiyevo. At any moment such incidents may trigger a flare-up of strikes which will sweep coal-mining areas like a chain reaction. However, we are convinced that it will not grow into a general miners' strike if the agreements already secured between the coal miners and the government are strictly complied with. If the miners become convinced that Moscow knows how to keep its word, that it can be trusted, there will be no reason to resort again to the big "stick" of strikes. This is the right direction. Would you agree?

[Kundruytskiy] I agree.

[Lomin] Me, too.

[Krylov] I will say more: It is exactly the failure to fulfill many agreements important in principle, in particular the key points of Resolution No. 608, that outrages us more than anything else. There is no argument, some points of this resolution have been fulfilled. Bonuses for work on night shifts have been doubled, and "hoofing pay" has been introduced for moving from the shaft of the mine to the work station; the normal issue of soap per person has doubled, and the issue of retirement benefits has been resolved.

[Ryabev] I may add several statistics. About R1.5 billion have been spent during the year under different budget items in order to improve the miners' standard of living. Wages alone have increased by 15 percent. Another half billion will be spent in order to implement the recently adopted Law on Retirement Benefits, and that much again for the implementation of the Law on Leave, which will be considered by the USSR Supreme Soviet very soon. Besides, R700 million in investment funds have been allocated additionally for purchasing equipment and improving social facilities for the employees of the industry, which will make it possible to increase the volume of housing construction this year by at least 15 percent compared to the 1989 level.

[Krylov] All of this is true. However, some of the key points of the resolution have not been fulfilled at all. This is the case with, for example, Point 15 which refers to the material-technical supply of the industry. Not only has it failed to improve, but it has become worse than before. Two months ago many mines were on the brink of a stoppage due to deliveries of lumber falling behind—there was nothing to prop the longwall with. There is a shortage of conveyer belts, combines....

[Shchadov] Indeed, Point 15 is not being fulfilled in full: The industry has been assigned quotas to back up between 94 and 97 percent of this year's plan. However, we frequently fail to obtain these percentages, too. Machine builders deliver smaller amounts of equipment, and "foresters," of timber. This is how a tragedy comes about: A poorly supported longwall caves in onto the people.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Who specifically is guilty of delivery failures?

[Ryabev] Enumerating addresses would take a lot of time. Material and technical supplies are an everlasting problem. This means that it is hard to count on fulfilling Point 15 soon.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] What can we count on in this case?

[Lomin] The miners have got to be fed as soon as possible and supplied with medicines. I know that the situation with both is difficult in our country at present. However, I am not demanding something special. Give the people a minimum "in keeping with physiological norms," which the resolution promised them. After all, at present a miner cannot take even boiled sausage or fish with him to the stope. They have disappeared! Meanwhile, on paper, in the documents, things are looking rosy: Respective quotas have been assigned in full. Who are we kidding?

[Kundruytskiy] What about drugs and medical equipment? In all of Donetsk Oblast there is just one respirator in the resuscitation center, which you cannot do without when rescuing a person crushed during a cave-in of the longwall. If two victims are brought to this center at the same time, physicians will have to choose who to give and not to give the gift of life to. This has already happened. Our physicians have begged for at least one more such respirator to be allocated to them from the former Fourth Administration of the USSR Ministry of Health. However, so far the former "Kremlin hospital" has no mind to share with us.

[Shchadov] The availability of medical equipment for mine hospitals and polyclinics is barely 60 to 65 percent. We try to find at least some way out of the situation by resorting to barter transactions or, in simpler terms, swapping above-the-plan coal for medical equipment and drugs. However, there isn't really a lot of above-the-plan coal. For the most part the situation should improve beginning next year, when all mine collectives receive the right to sell between 5 and 10 percent of the coal produced at their discretion.

[Ryabev] I would like to clarify this. Only some of the mining collectives included improvements in the supply of foodstuffs and medicines in their demands last year. Within the framework of Resolution No. 608, the government assumed responsibility for bringing their availability to public-catering enterprises to the level of norms in effect. There is no argument that life, with its problems that keep coming up, is much more extensive than the document in question. We cannot by any means restrict ourselves to its framework: The issue of food supplies and medical support should be resolved. However, at the roundtable today we agreed to discuss the agreements already signed.

[Lomin] Correct, let us talk about them only. The introduction of an extended, 57-day leave on account of harmful conditions was one of the four most significant demands of miners. This demand has not been met yet.

[Krylov] And no objective circumstances interfere with its immediate fulfillment. What is the problem then?

[Kundruytskiy] I believe that immediate compliance with the "leave" provision could play the role of a valve through which "steam could be let off," and a strike explosion could be prevented. The people would feel immediately that they have not been forgotten, they are being taken care of, things are moving, and, therefore, there is no need to resort to the strike stick prod.

[Ryabev] I agree with you completely on this. The Law on Leave should be considered by the USSR Supreme Soviet very soon. Believe me, the government is doing everything possible in order for things to turn out this way. Many suggestions have been made concerning the draft law. Work on them will be finished by the end of June or in July.

[Lomin] I would say that it is dangerous to postpone the discussion of the leave law until the fall session. After all, summer is upon us, during which last year's strike record may be broken. God save us from such records.

[Shchadov] As far as I have heard, the leave law will be discussed in the fall, but with a provision which is significant in principle: It will take effect as of 1 January 1991, as was promised to the people.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] It is all right if the people find this provision satisfactory. What if they interpret it as an excuse, as justification for dragging your feet yet again?

[Krylov] This cannot be entirely ruled out.

[Ryabev] Nothing in the world can be entirely ruled out. However, we should proceed primarily from accomplishing specific tasks facing the parliament, the government, and the country. At present the main task is known. It was clearly set forth in a report by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov. This is our transition to a regulated market under which it is easier to solve many problems, including those of the miners.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Incidentally, the economic independence of mines, strip mines, and other enterprises was one of the demands of miners.

[Ryabev] They have already been granted this right by a decision of the government. By now, one mining collective in three has acquired economic independence. The rest cannot take advantage of this right for various reasons, primarily due to low profitability.

[Krylov] Pardon me, what kind of economic independence can there be if the self-cost of coal at most mines of, say, the Donbass exceeds considerably its wholesale price at which the state purchases it from us? For a majority of our mines, current economic independence is an absolute sham! To be sure, it is planned to increase coal prices by a factor of 1.6 to 1.7 beginning next year. However, this is absolutely insufficient. Prices for Donbass coal should be increased by a minimum of a factor

of three or four in order to make producing it profitable. However, I am afraid that if this were the case our coal would become golden indeed, and nobody would buy it.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] This question goes to the representatives of the government: What stands in the way of your increasing coal prices by a factor of three or four?

[Ryabev] Such an increase will immediately affect the entire chain of prices in the country and will cause the kind of inflation which our consumers, including miners, will simply not be able to cope with. This is why we are leaning toward another way to solve this problem. At present, state subsidies to the coal industry come to approximately R8 billion a year....

[Shchadov] More precisely, R7.862 billion.

[Ryabev] So, we believe that in the 13th Five-Year Plan as well quite substantial support in subsidies for the coal industry should be maintained.

[Kundruytskiy] We do not need this support. We know what it leads to. By using it, the state keeps the coal miners on a short leash, preventing them from as much as breathing a word about genuine economic independence. Just try to speak up—they will immediately cut back your subsidies!

To my mind, the assertion that there is no market for our "golden" coal is naive. If we think about it, there have been takers for it for a long time now. Subsidies for us are not plucked out of the air but rather from the pockets of citizens and collectives of enterprises which transfer a lion's share of their hard-earned money to the treasury. Their money should be given back to them, let them decide themselves what to buy and at what price.

In short, we demand real economic independence rather than the truncated version of it which the officials are vigorously foisting on us. We intend to seek real independence in all legal ways, including strikes.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Are the miners aware of the fact that the government is no longer as afraid of strikes as it was last summer? The goverament has become used to them. According to some data, coal consumers have accumulated enough coal to wait out two or three months without new deliveries in case of something happening. Do you see that a strike is not going to be much use?

[Lomin] We will see about that. You should keep in mind the fact that the credit of trust in the government is no longer what it used to be last summer. Personally I would prefer to do without a strike. However, if it still breaks out it cannot be ruled out that workers in many other regions of the country will join them, in particular those where "leftists" have recently come to power, where some leaders called for a general political strike as early as last fall. Then, the people will demand the resignation of the government rather than sausage, soap, and long leaves due to harmful conditions. I would not venture a prediction of the possible course of events if Sverdlovsk, Moscow, and Leningrad, keyed up by the forthcoming price increase, make such demands, following Vorkuta, the Kuzbass, and the Donbass.

[Ryabev] First of all they may, as you say, come forward not only following the miners but also on their own. So, let us not engage in predictions. Secondly, I see nothing fatal in some people talking about the resignation of the government. At present, everybody is free to state his point of view openly. Under such conditions it would be stupid to count on unanimous approval. However, it would be nice to hear some constructive proposals regarding a way out of the existing situation following the shouts of "Down with!" As a rule, those who make more noise than anyone else do not have such proposals to make. Finally, the parliament usually decides who is to work in the government and who is not.

[Krylov] Don't get us wrong. We do not at all set the goal of "bringing down" the government. Our task is different: To ensure that all the miners' socioeconomic demands are met by working hand in hand with the government, to ensure this peaceably.

However, judge for yourselves: How can the coal miners respond to, say, a TV appearance by Lev Alekseyevich Voronin who maintained half a year ago that the miners were completely satisfied with actions of the government aimed at solving their problems? Such assurances were given at exactly the time when the situation in the coal-mining areas was particularly difficult. May reassuring speeches inspire someone's trust under the circumstances? I don't think so!

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] The demand "Down with Shchadov!" may be heard in the mines here and there. What is the reason for it?

[Krylov] People spend weeks in the lobby of Mikhail Ivanovich in order to get an appointment with him. He decides everything himself. Comrade Shchadov's deputies do not sign any serious document without his consent. It is quite possible that if he delegated some responsibilities to others and displayed more of a democratic attitude there would be fewer attacks against him.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Mikhail Ivanovich, what would you say to this?

[Shchadov] I do not agree with such talk at all. The minister may be the most democratic person in the industry. Nobody waits in his dressing room for weeks. However, if the minister has left for a business trip throughout the entire country, and at this time somebody comes to him without warning, and on top of that is angry with the minister for not being there, this tells us something about the person visiting.... As far as my deputies are concerned, they resolve many issues themselves. I believe that some loudmouths begin to get personal when they have nothing to say about the merits of it.

[Kundruytskiy] You should not call the miners loudmouths. We a great deal to say. The people are outraged when the desire is to get rid of them by way of an incomplete solution to their problems; this is all there is to it! We have insisted and will insist on complete economic independence, on a fundamental improvement in material and technical supplies, on the immediate resolution of the issue of leave, and on many other things which were discussed today around this table.

[Shchadov] On this point the ministry is entirely on the side of the miners, and intends to support them in the future.

[Ryabev] And the government, too.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] So, if these intentions are borne out by deeds it will, perhaps, be possible to retain the struggle of workers for their rights within peaceful bounds this summer. This means that tremendous economic, political, and moral losses which the strike path is fraught with may be avoided.

Conversion Concept Aimed at Earning Currency

PM0806090590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[S. Leskov report: "Conversion: A New But Promising Venture"]

[Text] A. Systsov, minister of the aviation industry, has explained at a press conference the concept of the conversion of one of the largest sectors in the defense complex.

Conversion may take two forms: the production of consumer goods using capacities no longer required for military orders, and the production of civil aircraft. Our aircraft industry exhibited in a number of national economic sectors at "Conversion-90," a representative international exhibition in Munich which ended recently. Western businessmen's interest in Soviet output was very high—the ministry has received orders for the supply of aviation equipment and consumer goods worth R5 billion.

But we remember the lines of people waiting for hours in front of Aeroflot desks. And experts estimate that in the next 15 years the number of passengers in the world will triple. This sets the sector a major task in expanding civil aircraft production while also taking into account the worsening environmental problems and the development of a new generation of airliners. It is this area, which, furthermore, makes it possible to enter the broad international market, that the minister considers the most promising for the conversion of the sector. Even advanced countries have a shortage of passenger planes at the moment—the output of Boeing and Douglas is sold out until 1996.

As A. Systsov stressed, no one in the world any longer tries to produce aircraft single-handed. Cooperation among several firms is the most promising form of aircraft construction. A number of recent international exhibitions at which the Ministry of the Aviation Industry displayed for the first time its "defense-oriented" activity have confirmed that the sector's achievements are up to the world standard. Has our defense capability suffered as a result? The active commodity exchange and close economic ties make the cooperating countries closely dependent on each other and promote further detente. Even the sale of warplanes of the MiG-29 type, in which many countries have been expressing an interest, will not lead to political destabilization. These planes can be used only in close combat conditions and cannot be used for strategic purposes.

In the next few years the Ministry of the Aviation Industry expects to increase production of civil aircraft by 170 percent. In addition, it is planned to switch to a new generation of planes, such as the Il-96-300M, the Tu-204M, the Tu-204, the Tu-334, and the Il-114, which will be more spacious and economical. Are these plans not likely to come to nothing? After all, the Il-96-300 and the Tu-204 are not in service yet, despite being promised long ago. Perhaps matters will be helped by the fact that some of the planned models are being designed on a competitive basis, while in the case of others work will be conducted jointly with major Western aircraft companies. In particular, the Tupolev Experimental Design Bureau and Deutsche Airbus are proposing to begin the development of passenger planes running on cryogenic fuel. The USSR intends to cooperate in the creation of the "Super-Concorde" supersonic airliner, whose development will take extraordinary efforts from many countries. Cooperation is being launched with such major firms as Rolls-Royce and SNECMA.

On the question of the ANT [Automation, Science and Technology] state-cooperative concern, one of the first unhappy attempts at the broad conversion the aviation industry, the minister noted that according to his information the investigation has not corroborated the talk of the embezzlement of millions or serious breaches of financial discipline by ANT. The main task of the Aviation Industry Ministry's foreign economic activity, the minister stressed, is to earn as much foreign currency as possible for the USSR.

Agricultural

Irkutsk Farms Afflicted by Prolonged Drought

LD1106135590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 10 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] An unusually prolonged drought has affected agricultural regions in Irkutsk Oblast.

[Correspondent V. Kodkin—identified by caption] The uninvited guest has brought trouble to the Nizhneangarsk region—and, as usual, troubles do not come singly. Dust-storms blew up in mid-May, leaving a trail of

destruction and parched earth. Every day the earth gives less and less hope to the sowers.

One-third of the 1.2 million hectares of arable land is now practically lost. Economists calculate that total losses amount to R20 million. Seven thousand five hundred tons of seeds urgently allocated to Irkustsk Oblast by the state agro-industrial organization [Gosagroprom] have lain on the earth during the lifeless devastation of May.

The "Banner of Lenin" collective farm [kolkhoz], like many other farms, has been forced to abandon sowing work. Thirty leasehold teams—fish breeders, vegetable growers, and livestock raisers—this year have received less than the guaranteed wage levels. Milk production is affected by the situation in the fields. There is little cause for satisfaction, but people have not just folded their arms; they hope to get fodder, at least, from the fields, so as to maintain a herd of 5,500 cattle. There will be somewhat fewer festivals in the village streets.

[V.A. Zusev, chairman of the "Banner of Lenin" collective farm—identified by caption] The position is currently that we are losing milk yields amounting to R2 million, and sales are down to one-third. The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Growers's Association intends to create an insurance association; this would include an agricultural bank, whose credits would assist our farm.

[Kodkin] So the new association that has just been set up will help alleviate the problem?

[Zusev] I think that it will help alleviate the problem. [video shows machines at work in the fields, interview with collective farm chairman]

Peasant Union Congress Opens 11 Jun

PM1206113790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Second Edition p 4

[N. Musiyenko and O. Stepanenko report: "Who Will Protect Peasants? Constituent Congress of USSR Peasants' Union Opened in Moscow Yesterday"]

[Text] Let us be blunt, this was not an ordinary event. Now that perestroyka has entered a critical phase when the division in society is increasing and new parties, associations, and groupings are being set up, the peasantry has stated the need for consolidation. Above all in its own ranks.

There are 1,718 delegates from nine union republics taking part in the congress. They are kolkhoz [collective farm] members, sovkhoz [state farm] workers, workers in the food and processing industries, leaseholders, owners of peasant farms, scientists, and the rural intelligentsia. The importance of the congress is shown by the fact that it is being attended by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev; A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet; N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Ye.K. Ligachev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for Questions of Agrarian Policy; Yu.D. Maslyukov, chairman of the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee]; Ye.S. Stroyev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and leaders of union ministries and departments.

A report on the formation of the USSR Peasants' Union was delivered by I.I. Kukhar, chairman of the organizing committee to prepare for the constituent congress and chairman of the Union Kolkhoz Council. The congress outlined its intention to adopt the Union's statutes, to issue an appeal to peasants, the working class, and all Soviet citizens, and to elect the Union's leading organs.

In the recess between sessions we met with congress delegates. There was one question: What do they expect from the Peasant Union?

L. Kireyenko, milking machine operator at the Krayev Sovkhoz, Vitebsk Oblast:

"I very much want the union to be our reliable supporter, aide, and protector. I'm 33. I have two daughters. That's why I look to the future, thinking about their fate too. Will they remain true to their native land? There are currently arguments about what form of economic management is better—kolkhozes and sovkhozes or the lease system and private farming [fermerstvo]. I believe that these arguments are not the main thing. The countryside has been very neglected and forgotten in our society. Whatever form you think up, if the necessities for working and living are lacking, there will be no sense to it. While we are arguing, supplies are getting worse and worse. I'm not talking about working conditions in the countryside. Take our livestock unit. We distribute feed by hand, and there is no milk line. And yet my 34 cows yield 6,314 kg of milk each a year. Who is concerned about us? It seems that the congress delegates are serious and intend to set up a really authoritative organ."

V. Vasilyev, director of the 22d CPSU Congress Sovkhoz in Chimkent Oblast:

"I will uphold the right of peasants and rural collectives to be autonomous. It has been said at the congress that we need a law to prevent anyone meddling with production. Moreover, we need a law to punish attempts to impose any diktat. Production should be the concern of those who produce the output. I think that our union should have wide-ranging rights and powers. It is the union which should formulate agrarian policy."

Indeed, many of these ideas were also expressed in the report of I. Kukhar, chairman of the organizing committee, and in the co-report by V. Nikitin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Commission on Food and Procurements. The first few hours of the congress show that the discussion will be acute. Rural problems have built up over decades. In eroding the boundary between city

and country during this period, as one delegate figuratively put it, we have eroded the countryside, but the boundaries have become even clearer.

It is impossible to enumerate all the problems which the congress delegates have been discussing with alarm and pain. These include the unfair economic relations between industry and agriculture, the continuation of the leftover principle when it comes to supplies for the countryside, and the countryside's chronic social lag behind the city.... All this dictates the urgent need to create a peasants' union—a sociopolitical organization which would serve socioeconomic transformation, the spiritual regeneration of the countryside, and the development of all forms of economic management in the countryside.

Unfortunately, at this congress too certain speakers failed to avoid the fashion of going to extremes. A call was heard for peasants to leave their dugouts, go on an all-out offensive, and exert pressure on the country's leadership, the government, collectives, and industrial enterprises. But the very course of the congress has made adjustments and amended the "radicalism" that was so clearly apparent. S. Drozd, general director of the "Gomselmash" Association, convincingly pointed out in his speech that machine builders too are not in any better position than peasants, and with the best will in the world have not yet been able to provide the countryside with what life itself demands. This is hampered by the bankruptcy of the existing economic mechanism. Changing it is the main task. And all of us—both workers and peasants—must resolve it together. We need consolidation not only within the framework of the Peasant Union but also in all of society.

The congress continues today.

Arguments Against Planned Food Tax Listed

PM1206115790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences V. Matusevich; first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction: "Food Tax on Peasant; Not a Step Forward to Emancipation But Two Steps Back to the Edict Economy"]

[Text] The discussion of the program made public by the USSR Government for the transition to the market has already revealed not simply a difference of opinions of ways of forming the market economy but also different understandings of the essence of market relations. The collective consideration of these problems revealed many discrepancies between the principles of the market economy proclaimed in the program and the system of measures for their implementation and also contradictions in the actual means of attaining the set goals.

Today we offer for your attention one view of the means of forming the food market set forth in the program.

Just a year has elapsed since the government adopted a package of resolutions expressing new strategic approaches toward the implementation of agrarian policy. The measures defined in them, particularly for the fundamental perestroyka of economic relations, have been the catalyst for the formation of market relations in the agro-industrial complex. Agricultural enterprises have received greater economic autonomy than ever including on questions of the disposal of the output they produce. The directive procedure for notifying them of the state order has been formally repealed. Farms have been granted the right to assume voluntarily the execution of the state order for the delivery of output to the all-Union and republican stocks.

Of course, the new principles for organizing purchases, based on the economic interest of the commodity producers and on the market instrument that is the contract, have largely remained declarations only. Nonetheless the countryside has already felt a certain easing of the administrative "embrace." And at the same time a situation has taken shape which has caused concern in the center. Under conditions where the city has been unable to provide the countryside, in exchange for food, with the necessary quantity of equipment, construction materials, and other resources, the flow of commodities from agriculture has somewhat decreased. In 1989 of the 211 million tonnes of grain harvested only 59 million were sold to the state, which is less than the volumes of procurements in years with a smaller gross harvest. The situation with regard to purchases of other foods is similar.

World experience, and indeed our own experience, convinces us that there are two ways out of this situation—either the resolute development of market relations or a return to the system of the administrative decree in whatever guise—state order, state target, or something else—it is set.

It would be natural to expect the further intensification of agrarian market relations in the government program. What is the criterion and specific mechanism for providing citizens and organizations with land? How to ensure in reality conditions for the development of a mixed economy and to free the peasant from the monopoly of the producer of agricultural equipment? Without answering these and a number of other questions the transition to the market is inconceivable. Unfortunately, these questions have not even been raised. After all, you cannot call the directive increasing of prices, the writing off of kolkhoz [collective farm] and sovkhoz [state farm] debts, and the guaranteed provision of centrally distributed resources market levers. But perhaps they are prerequisites for the formation of the market? But then it must be admitted that we have been creating them throughout history. After all these measures have been in every decision on the agrarian question.

Nor can you call the idea of a food tax a new one. It is true that the government program contains only scant mention of it. The items which have appeared in the press on this score allow us to judge the resurrection of

the literally understood slogan "from the requisitioning of grain to taxation in kind." INdeed, normative documentation on the introduction of taxation in kind has already been approved by the central departments.

The thrust of this measures is that peasants will be obliged to sell a certain proportion of their output to the state at prices set by the state. The supporters of this solution, drawing an analogy with the New Economic Policy, claim that the relatively low taxation rates will make it possible to guarantee both the formation of a centralized stock and the development of commercial trade in the remaining agricultural output.

It goes without saying that the food tax of the New Economic Policy period was an extraordinarily successful element of Lenin's economic policy. But the question arises: Is it expedient to repeat at the present stage something that has been gone through already? I think that nostalgia for a decision which was capable of rapidly getting the country out of famine could today play a bad joke on us.

First of all because the period of the twenties and the present differ qualitatively. And history cannot offer us a socioeconomic milieu similar to the previous one to repeat the experiment.

We should also recall something else from history. Only immediately after its introduction (against the background of an enslaving, forcible war-communist grain requisition) did the food tax in kind, exacted without compensation, seem to the peasants to be almost the acme of freedom in economic activity. Incidentally, Lenin himself stressed the dual nature of the food tax. And the restricted nature of the economic system connected with the "old" administrative-edict principle in the food tax became clear as early as 1926-1927. Despite attempts to improve it and adapt it to the constantly changing conditions, the peasants began to reduce the volumes of production of marketable grain. The level of marketability declined and arrears increased. That means that of itself the food tax, as became clear back during the New Economic Policy years, does not form interest in increasing production volume. Prices are the incentive, and since that is so then today there is not need whatever for the food tax.

In the past, in analyzing the reason for the reduction in grain procurements, we did not want to recognize this fact. The "grain procurements crisis" enabled Stalin, on the pretext of the low level of production of marketable goods by peasant farms, to justify the need to switch to large public farms. The results are well known. They were the bondage of the producer and the "taboo" against the market. There are echos of this even now: Every third kilogram of grain which we ate in 1989 was imported.

I shall say more: We have no need to return to the idea of the food tax because our present practice of the state order differs little from it. People will object that by comparison with the state order the proportion of the food tax in gross output can be reduced. But let us remember that, after all, under the conditions of total administrative diktat, when the entire 100 percent was taken, we continued to build up grain purchases abroad and now that we do not take everything we are buying no less grain for hard currency. So I think that it is not a question of proportion at all here. You cannot build a market economy by creating two degrees of freedom, as it were, two levels of management—the economic and the noneconomic—for the producer. And after all it must be honestly admitted that the food tax is a fixed, compulsory state target. There is more that is old than new in this form of economic mutual relations with the peasantry. In fact this means not coming closer to market relations but deviating from them, sliding back to old preperestroyka positions. This "food tax" moves us closer to food requisitioning.

It is true that the supporters of the food tax have one argument which is attractive to the ordinary awareness: The state has been obliged to take this step in the interests of the masses because only by acting in this way is it possible to guarantee the collection of the necessary quantity of agricultural output. But is this premise correct? After all even in the toughest years of administrative management plans for purchases and deliveries were still not fulfilled. The introduction of the food tax does not guarantee what we want either. If the peasant has no interest in producing a particular type of output he will change the direction of his specialization: He will switch from meat to flowers, perhaps. Distortion again. Then what? Change the tax rates again and introduce them for all products? Or perhaps, again as a "recommendation," we should command or "advise" the peasant administratively to produce what we need?

Everything falls into place if you realize that the state has absolutely no need of purchases of agricultural output in such large volumes. Even the project's authors are inclined to the solution that for instance something in the region of about 60 million tonnes or just a little more of this grain needs to be purchased, when you consider all food and other requirements, including reserves. Then the question arises: Why fence the kitchen garden around with the food tax if we already have these 60 million tonnes now, even with our feeble market?

The supporters of the food tax assure us that the food tax set according to single normatives will rule out voluntarism and the interference of the organs of management in the producer's affairs. Yet unified tax rates set indiscriminately for all types of farms are of themselves voluntarism and stereotyping. In that respect the food tax of the time of the New Economic Policy was far more perfect because it was calculated on the basis not only of the results of agricultural labor, as is proposed now, but also with a consideration for existing resources—the amount of land per mouth to be fed and the number of livestock. And its norms were differentiated according to groups of farms.

The food tax which is proposed for us today, however, fails to take account either of different forms of economic management or of the enormous natural and economic differences. Yet direct expenditure of labor on the production of a quintal of output differs very greatly. For instance, in 1987 the prime cost of a quintal of grain on the farms of the central Chernozem oblasts was R7.21 while on the sovkhozes of the Far East zone it was R25.52. How can we approach everyone with the same yardstick here?

Or take the following fact. In Kazakhstan about 1,000 farms obtain a grain yield of approximately five quintals per hectare. If we deduct the seeds spent all that is left is something like 2.6 quintals. It is clear that taking from them one-third of their grain means ruining them completely. Against this background even levying from all farms an equal percentage of their profit or revenue looks far fairer.

Indeed I would be in no hurry to assert that we intend to introduce a food tax which is no burden at all. For instance, it is planned to exact 30 percent of the gross harvest of food grain in barn weight [ambarnyy ves]. Surely that is no small amount? Let us count. If the tax had been in operation in 1987—not a bad harvest year—all grain left on the farms for sale on the market would have totalled only 15 percent of the gross harvest. You cannot help thinking of the old joke. The generous husband tells us wife: Here's 10 kopeks just for you, my dear, get whatever you want."

The stereotype of the leveling approach is no less dangerous. The proposed procedure for levying the food tax in kind makes no distinction between a large public farm and an individual peasant farm. And that is not only an economic question but also a political one. The peasant will not agree to cultivate a leased plot if three quarters of the cotton he grows is taken without asking for "the motherland's big money bag [khirman]." The peasant from Naro-Fominsk or indeed any other peasant will not agree to become an individual farmer if half the milk or meat he produces has to be sold for the "food tax." And all that in addition to payment for the land and other demands. The new forms of economic management are thus being deliberately driven into an impasse.

I do not even mention the fact that with such measures we are negating the operation of the laws on cooperatives, on ownership, and on the land. After all these laws firmly state that the peasant is the owner of all the output he produces and is free to dispose of it as he sees fit. Now we are again seeking to encroach on his interests: Everyone will soon go out onto the market with their goods but the peasant will again have to take a substantial proportion of his output to the state and sell it at an arbitrary price which does not consider real costs.

All this makes us also seriously doubt the promised noninterference in producers' affairs by local organs of power. Since targets are being retained (albeit in the form of a food tax), commanders will be found. It is naive to suppose that the center, and not the local organs of management, will implement tax policy. Incidentally, in the past no one gave the rayon committee procurement targets either, but that did not change matters.

No, we do not want to radically review stereotyped approaches. We speak of the creation of a system for motivating highly productive labor and building up production yet we ourselves try to place the old collar on the peasants, but with a new bridle. We announce a transition to the market but in fact we place the "free" commodity producer in a tax and price "cage."

I know that references to foreign experience are now increasingly angering a number of economic managers. Nonetheless I shall turn to methods of regulating the U.S. agricultural produce market. They are sometimes tough, but they proceed from unconditional economic freedom for the commodity producer and his interests. That is why, even in striving in some what to restrict the individual farmer, the state builds its mutual relations through a whole package of aid for him. For instance, just for those who produce wheat there are 20 "policies" of aid, including the policies of prices, direct subsidies, and subsidies for resources. That is, before obtaining the desired result the state tries to give the farmer everything necessary for success. But in our policy of mutual relations with agriculture we continue to seek only to take.

Scientific

Cosmonauts Pictured Entering 'Kristall' Module

PM1206144590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 11 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Report over video on installation and startup operations on Kristall module]

[Text] [Newscaster] This morning the new Kristall module took up its work station at one of the side docking ports of the Mir space station.

[Video shows cosmonauts at work]

[Voice from mission control center] ...Take care not to break it.

[Cosmonaut] We've opened it, we've opened it!

[Mission control center voice] Opened it? Well, we congratulate you! [video shows cosmonaut entering Kristall module]

[Mission control center voice] Tolya, switch on the light in the module! [video shows cosmonaut switching on the light]

[unintelligible sentence, cosmonaut reporting that he has switched on the light]

[Newscaster] Cosmonauts Anatoliy Solovyev and Aleksandr Balantin have again entered the module in which, several months ago, they underwent training

sessions on earth. The solar batteries have been fully opened and the crew has started connecting the Kristall to the general circuits of the orbital station.

'Kristall-Mir' Docking, Implications Reported

PM1206160390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 10 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Reportage by S. Slipchenko, P. Orlov, Yu. Korovkin, identified by caption, on the docking of the Kristall module with the Mir space station]

[Text] [Newscaster] Today at 1447 hours Moscow time the new Kristall technological module docked with the Mir space station.

[Correspondent] To bring you up to date let me tell you that four days after the first unsuccessful attempt, specialists at the mission control center realized which engine had failed, switched to the backup engine, and the docking today could not have gone more smoothly.

[Ya.Ye. Ayzenberg, director general of the "Elektropribor" science-and-production association, identified by caption, facing camera] We have mastered the main and most important task. We have docked, that's it.

[Correspondent] [video shows people at work at mission control center] Who will work with the module now? Will it be a group of specialists as in the past, or will representatives of plants, ministries, suppliers, and envoys of planning, agricultural, and other organizations begin to trickle into the mission control center? Somehow we cannot visualize this, and here is why.

[Another correspondent] [video shows him interviewing three people watching docking at mission control center] Are there any doubts about the docking in orbit which we have just watched? Will it produce the return for which we are hoping?

[USSR Pilot-Cosmonaut V.V. Polyakov, deputy director of the Medical and Biological Problems Institute, identified by caption] Certain ministries, aware of the potential inherent in space, are deliberately keeping aloof, rather than coming forward with orders.

[Correspondent] Why?

[Polyakov] It seems to me that this is because it is not advantageous for them. It is even advantageous for them to stay away. After all, they would have to invest their own funds to obtain information, about the ecological situation, for instance, which they themselves are disrupting.

[USSR Pilot-Cosmonaut A.P. Aleksandrov, identified by caption] Agriculture, for example, has still not developed any systems which could be placed on board.

[USSR Pilot-Cosmonaut A.A. Leonov, in uniform, identified by caption] Or rather, they have developed them but they do not want to use them.

[Aleksandrov] Precisely.

[A.A. Leonov] Our data are objective, the data which we are able to obtain have differed from the USSR State Committee for Statistics information by as much as 30 percent.

[Correspondent] So who will use this most high-tech and valuable information in the world?

[Leonov] We are getting many orders from abroad, where people understand all this. But our comrades are still looking at all this askance.

[Correspondent] Soviet people are expecting and even demanding returns from space research. For a long time scientsts tried to persuade us that the entire 30 years of Soviet space research are just the base of the pyramid whose tip has now been attained with the Kristall module. Now the module is in orbit. It represents objective eyes which count arable land, herds of livestock, moisture and salt in the fields; it can produce pure medicines and grow crystals. However, at the same time it also shows up false statistics, it renders worthless hundreds of departmental documents and wipes out departmental jobs, if you like. This is where space research comes into conflict with sluggishness and inertia.

And what do those who developed the module and launched it into space expect from it?

[Yu.P. Semenov, rocket and space system chief designer, identified by caption] This is the beginning of far-reaching work in the sphere of technology and biotechnology.

[USSR Pilot Cosmonaut V.A. Solovyev, in charge of the mission, identified by caption] We expect a great deal. We would like it to start up industrial production, we would like it to start producing for the earth.

[A.V. Vasilkovskiy, deputy chief designer, identified by caption] The docking of this module alone expands the potential for building large-scale projects in space.

[Correspondent] This is what the Mir station may look like tomorrow. [video shows model of station] And the results of its work will depend less on the state of weightlessness in space, than on the degree of inertia on earth.

Military

Yazov, Lizichev, Frolov Speak at Festival

PM1206135190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "We Thank the Friends of the Newspaper"]

[Excerpt] A KRASNAYA ZVEZDA open day was held Sunday 10 June in the M. Gorkiy Central House of Culture and Recreation. According to preliminary figures, more than 30,000 people gathered for the celebrations; this was

helped not only by the uncommonly sunny weather, which provided the first summery day suitable for recreation in the past week, but also by the tremendous interest evinced by Muscovites and the capital's guests in the life of the Armed Forces, along with all its complexities and problems that KRASNAYA ZVEZDA now describes with great frankness. Incidentally, during a meeting with mass media leaders, journalists, and radio and television personnel at the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA press center, Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, himself spoke about many things for the first time, including the nature and aims of military reform. Today openness and an objective approach to phenomena inherent in the current difficult situation are becoming increasingly characteristic of the whole military press, which is taking an active part in the country's social life. As for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, stressed that its leading positions are being considerably reinforced and the newspaper can boast stable, lasting prestige both within the Army and within the country.

I.T. Frolov, CPSU Central Committee secretary and editor in chief of PRAVDA, addressed the meeting. [passage omitted]

Ministry Discusses Internal Troops

LD1206195390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1135 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Igor Aramov]

[Text] Moscow, 12 Jun (TASS)—Over the last two years Internal Troops of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] have been used in 18 regions of the country. Over this period they have detained more than 24,000 people for various crimes and violations; they have confiscated more than 4,000 firearms, over 73,000 munitions, and about 500 explosive devices. While carrying out their official duties 16 servicemen have been killed, four have gone missing, and more than 1,000 have been injured. This was reported at a briefing today at the USSR MVD by Major General Aleksandr Grienko, head of the political directorate of the USSR MVD Internal Troops.

"The tense situation which has arisen as a consequence of the aggravation of interethnic relations in a number of regions of the Soviet Union has dictated the need to use units and detachments of the USSR MVD Internal Troops to maintain public order, the general noted. The more so, as the conflicts are often accompanied by mass disorders and pogroms, cases of arson and the murder of totally innocent people, and the total or partial destabilization of the situation."

"It is exactly such forces, with their precise organization and coordination, well trained and prepared for operations in extreme situations and appropriately equipped, that are capable of effectively countering wide-scale criminal acts. Such troops, he stressed, have often proved the only real force and guarantee of securing the constitutional rights of Soviet people and their personal safety."

In the view of representatives of the Internal Troops, the laws currently in force regarding precisely this subdivision of the USSR MVD take insufficient account of all the peculiarities of this service. For this reason a law on the USSR MVD Internal Troops is now being prepared.

At the briefing, journalists were for the first time able to become acquainted with representatives of a service, concerning the creation of which active debate has been conducted for nearly a year,—the professionals from the special subdivision of the Internal Troops. There are many who wish to sign a contract, notwithstanding all the rigours of selection. But there are insufficient funds. The USSR MVD has as yet only been able to set up one such company in the Dzerzhinskiy division.

Armed Forces Contribute Precious Metals

LD1206122790 Moscow TASS in English 1222 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 12 TASS—The Soviet Armed Forces contribute considerable amounts of silver and gold to the USSR reserves, the PRAVITELSTVENNY VESTNIK newspaper writes today. In the first quarter of this year, the military turned over to the state 38 kilomgrams of gold and 27 tonnes of silver more than the same period last year.

USSR Defence Ministry information reveals that there is now not a single gram of silver, gold or platinum in the strongrooms of the USSR Defence Ministry. Additives of precious matals are used at war industry enterprises when military equipment is being created. They impart special strength to various junctions and instruments in missiles, aircraft and submarines.

A MiG-23 aircraft contains 512 grams of gold, 69 grams of platinum and more than 17 kilograms of silver. Naturally, precious metals are restored at special enterprises.

This year the Soviet Defence Ministry is to return 564 tonnes of silver, 3,000 kilograms of gold and 300 kilograms of platinum to the Soviet treasury. Indexes set earlier by the government have been surpassed naturally as a result of reductions of armed forces and the conversion of their armaments.

Baltic Republics

Gorbachev Meeting With Baltic Leaders 'Positive'

LD1206195190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Following a meeting between the Soviet president and the chairmen of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian Supreme Councils—Vytautas Landsbergis, Anatoliy Gorbunov, and Arnold Ryuytel—a press conference took place.

Commentator Benas Rupeika spoke about this to Nikolajus Medvedevas, deputy of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania.

[Begin recording] [Medvedevas] Gorbunov stated that they have agreed with Gorbachev that if Latvia freezes its declaration of independence, negotiations about the transitional period can start at once.

[Rupeika] But this is Gorbunov.

[Medvedevas] This is Latvia. The positive fact arising from the Gorbachev-Landsbergis meeting is that they did not get angry with each other.

[Rupeika] This is interesting.

[Medvedevas] This means that they stated their opinions. Landsbergis stated why we cannot freeze our declaration on independence—because Lithuania would not understand [words indistinct] and Gorbachev explained to Landsbergis why he cannot [words indistinct] the consequences of freezing, not of the declaration itself but of its consequences. But they decided that Gorbachev will consult about this with his team and Landsbergis will consult with his team. When asked to speak about the results in a more concrete manner, Landsbergis replied that he would like his associates to be the first people to hear about this matter—that is—the Supreme Council Presidium and the Supreme Council itself. That is, they should be the first to be informed about this, and not the correspondents.

[Rupeika] It is pleasant to hear this.

[Medvedevas] I understand that some points of contact have been found. One could hope that this blockade will be lifted next week, maybe, or later or even earlier, perhaps.

[Rupeika] What is your personal opinion about the mood which prevailed during the conference?

[Medvedevas] I think that the mood was positive, good. People understood that we and the other team were making every effort to find a way out of this situation, which no one wants.

[Rupeika] And our team is returning to Vilnius?

[Medvedevas] It is leaving now.

[Rupeika] And the prime minister and Brazauskas remain?

[Medvedevas] Maybe she will talk with Ryzhkov tomorrow. [end recording]

Interethnic Relations Viewed

LD1206184390 Moscow TASS in English 1840 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 12 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov received in the Kremlin today Anatoly Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet; Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet; and Arnold Ryuytel, chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet, who were in Moscow for the meeting of the Federation Council of the USSR.

They exchanged views on the situation that has arisen in inter- ethnic relations.

More on Meeting

LD1206210290 Moscow TASS in English 2046 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandras Budris]

[Text] Moscow June 13 TASS—A news conference of chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Vytautas Landsbergis and chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Gorbunov was held late on Tuesday in the building of Lithuania's permanent office in Moscow. The two chairmen and chairman of the parliament of the third Soviet Baltic republic, Estonia, Arnold Ryuytel had met on Tuesday with President Mikhail Gorbachev and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Nikolay Ryzhkov.

During this meeting, described by participants as "a preliminary consultation", a useful exchange of views on the situation around the Baltic republics took place.

Landsbergis noted that "positions were somehow specified, and the sides identified a point of contact, which can facilitate a way out of the situation and the beginning of an actual political dialogue between Lithuania and the Soviet Union and the lifting, at the same time, of the economic blockade".

Landsbergis did not say what specific proposals had been made during the meeting but pointed out that they needed discussion by Lithuanian parliament.

The news conference was told that the three Baltic leaders had taken advantage, in accordance with an earlier mutual understanding, of the meeting of the USSR Federation Council, of which they are members ex officio, to talk with Mikhail Gorbachev.

Their presence at the meeting of the Federation Council was a useful prelude for over an hour-long talk with the Soviet leaders, Vytautas Landsbergis noted. Some new nuances voiced at the meeting, including the concept of a future Soviet federation as a union of sovereign states, evoked our particular interest, Landsbergis stressed.

Moscow Official, Prunskiene Discuss Cooperation

LD1206200390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] The chairmen of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian Supreme Councils—Vytautas Landsbergis, Anatoliy Gorbubov, and Arnold Ryuytel—who are in Moscow, took part today in the Kremlin meeting of the Federal Council.

In the evening, the leaders of the three republics—Vytautas Landsbergis, Arnold Ryuytel, and Anatoliy Gorbunov—met with the Soviet Union's President Mikhail Gorbachev for approximately one hour. The participants in the meeting are satisfied with its results.

Meanwhile, Kazimieras Prunskiene, the prime minister of the republic of Lithuania, and her deputy Algirdas Brazauskas, were to meet USSR Council of Ministers Chairman Nikolay Ryzhkov, but the planned meeting did not take place. It should take place tomorrow.

Intensive activity was also taking place in the Lithuanian mission. Our two government leaders [words indistinct] with political figures. Deputy chairman of the Moscow Soviet, Sergey Stankevich, arrived later to meet Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene. A business-like meeting took place about future cooperation.

Landsbergis Describes Meeting With Yeltsin

LD1206214390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1955 GMT 12 Jun 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Here is a report on a press conference at the Lithuanian permanent mission in Moscow.

[Correspondent S. Chernov] It took place late this evening. The chairmen of the Supreme Soviets of Latvia, Gorbunov; and Lithuania, Landsbergis, answered questions from journalists who had gathered there. The press conference was devoted to the Federation Council meeting which took place in the Kremlin, and USSR President Gorbachev's personal meeting with the heads of the three Baltic republics. First and foremost, the journalists wanted to know whether anything had changed in relations between the Center and the Baltic republics after this meeting?

[Begin Landsbergis recording] We are sorry that we do not have a more definite point of contact whereby we might find a way out of the present situation, so that a real political dialogue between Lithuania and the Soviet Union can begin. [end recording]

[Chernov] The journalists asked questions about the first Congress of Russian People's Deputies and Landsbergis' meeting wth Yeltsin.

[Begin Landsbergis recording] Earlier, at the meeting with Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, there was a discussion regarding the fact that direct links, including political links, are necessary to conclude treaties. And today we continued this subject somewhat, so that we can strive toward this. [end recording]

Vilnius Radio Carries 12 June Supreme Council

Agenda Adopted

LD1206091190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0700 GMT on 12 June begins a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

The relay begins with Deputy Abisalas presenting the draft agenda as follows:

1. "Concerning the property owned by political parties and organizations;"

2. "The Act of Restitution of the position of the catholic church in Lithuania;"

3. "Concerning the Inspectorate for the Protection of the Monuments of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania;"

4. "Draft Law on State Enterprises of the Republic of Lithuania;"

5. "Concerning the genocide of the Jewish people during the period of Nazi occupation;"

6. "Confirmation of the Statute of Vilnius University;"

7. "Concerning the decisions adopted by the local deputies of Vilnius Rayon council on 9 May;"

8. "Regulations of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania."

At 0711 GMT the agenda is adopted by majority vote.

At 0712 GMT discussion of the first item on the agenda begins. A draft resolution is presented to the deputies, a commission is formed, and the names of the members announced. Deputies belonging to the CPSU are asked to express their opinion on the resolutions by they decline to do so. A vote is taken on the resolution which is adopted by 96 votes in favor, none against, and three abstentions.

At 0719 GMT the deputies begin to discuss the protection of cultural monuments. Deputy Ilgunas presents the issue for debate.

At 0729 GMT a draft decision on the issue was read by Deputy Ilgunas. This was followed by questions to Ilgunas. Most of the deputies expressed the view that the republic does not need so many institutions which deal with the same issue, namely the protection of the national heritage.

At 0745 GMT a deputy criticizes the cuts in financial subsidies for the republic's cultural needs, and raises the issue of greater protection for the Lithuanian language.

Some deputies express the view that bearing in mind the financial and political difficulties at the moment in the republic, the setting up of an inspectorate of this type should be postponed. This view is not supported and by majority vote it is decided to set up an Inspectorate for the Cultural Heritage and Protection of Monuments of Culture.

At 1824 GMT the deputies begin to discuss the declaration on the genocide of Jewish people in Lithuania during the Nazi occupation. The deputies had been acquainted with the text in advance and so the declaration is adopted unanimously.

At 0828 GMT session is adjourned.

University Statute Debated

LD1206105890

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0900 GMT on 12 June resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

At 0900 GMT the debate on confirming the statute of Vilnius University began. The deputies broaden the debate to include the issue of the autonomy of any school of higher education in Lithuania.

At 1015 GMT deputies from the Polish minority demand that the statute should guarantee high school graduates from schools where the language of instruction was the Polish language and that they should be able to take their university entrance exams in the Polish language.

At 1041 GMT the deputies agreed to postpone confirmation of the statute until this afternoon. With this, the session adjourned until 1210 GMT.

Catholic Church Resolution Adopted

LD1206142590

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1210 GMT on 12 June resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

At 1210 GMT,the session resumes its work. The statute of Vilnius University is discussed in detail. A vote is taken on each of the articles.

At 1240 GMT debates of the statute are in progress.

AT 1253 GMT debates on individual articles on the statute are in progress. Votes are taken on each article.

At 1305 GMT a draft law of the republic of Lithuania is adopted by the Supreme Council of the republic on confirmation of the statute of Vilnius University is read. A majority of votes adopts the statute. From now on the oldest universtiy in the country will start working along different guidelines similar to those of the oldest universities of Europe.

At 1310 GMT the next item on the agenda is the reinstatement of the position of the catholic church in Lithuania. K. Motieka presents a draft resolution act on the position of the catholic church as well as of the sufferings and privations which the church has been subjected to during thest 50 years. He says that this act will be of great importance at this difficult time for the Lithuanian nation; it will help to consolidate the nation.

At 1321 GMT debates on the issue begin.

At 1338 GMT a vote is taken on each paragraph of the restitution act. Following this, a decision of the Supreme Council is adopted which includes the following points:

1. To establish legal adjustment in the relationship between the state and the church,

2. to confirm the act of restitution of the position of the catholic church in Lithuania,

3. to entrust the state commission of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania with the task of preparing a draft act for the reinstatement of the concordat between the Holy See and the republic of Lithuania.

A vote is taken on the above resolution; 87 in favor, two abstain. Several deputies did not take part in voting. 1. Therefore, out of 106 deputies present, with the majority of 87 voting in favor, the decision on the act of restitution of the position of the catholic church in Lithuania is adopted.

The session then adjourns until 1420 GMT.

Rayon Chairman Speaks

LD1206170190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1420 GMT on 12 June resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

At this time, the Supreme Council discusses the decisions adopted by the Vilnius area, which is predominantly inhabited by Poles.

A deputy for this area takes the floor and invites the deputies to abstain from adopting any decision on the issue, because the local council did not have enough time to prepare a draft decision on the status of this area in the republic. The deputy says that when the document is ready, it will be presented to the Supreme Council for discussion.

Deputy K.Motieka supports this proposal and asks the house to postpone the discussion of the issue.

At 1432 GMT debates continue on this issue.

At 1457 GMT the chairman of the Vilnius Rayon Council (name indistinct) complains about discrimination against the Lithuanian speaking population in the rayon. Many Lithuanian officials in the rayon have been dismissed, he says. There are 57 schools in the rayon but only in two schools are lessons in Lithuanian; in all other schools they are in Russian and Polish.

At 1515 GMT the radio announcer says that some deputies left the hall during the proceedings.

At 1515 GMT Deputy Raila proposes that the Ministry of Justice should explain to the rayon the legal implications of their decisions. The rayon should submit to the council their draft amendments to the local government laws and regulations. Alternative projects could be also submitted by individual electors, the deputy says.

At 1535 GMT three proposals are made: to postpone the debate until tomorrow, until 19 June, or until 15 July.

At 15640 GMT by a majority of votes, the deputies decide to postpone the debate on this issue (?for two weeks).

At 1545 GMT an announcement is made that at 1200 local time on 15 June, an extraordinary session of the council will take place to commemorate the events of June 1940 and June 1941. The arrangements for the 15 June celebrations are discussed.

At 1548 GMT the live relay is discontinued. The next plenary session will take place tomorrow. The time for the meeting is not given.

TASS on 12 June Supreme Council Session

LD1206191790 Moscow TASS in English 1852 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Kazus Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius June 12 TASS—A critical situation arose today at the session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet when it came to the discussion of an item on the agenda relating to the May decision by the Vilnius District Council to proclaim the rural area outside Vilnius a Polish national-territorial region.

Many deputies tended to postpone the discussion in order to avoid fanning tensions, suggesting that the situation in the region be additionally researched and meetings with the population be called to discuss the problem. But when it was decided to give the floor only to a representative of those who oppose the striving of the majority of the area's inhabitants for autonomy, deputies representing the interests of ethnic Poles in Lithuania walked out of the session.

No agreement was reached today on how to deal with the problem.

The republican Supreme Soviet also considered a property issue. It decided to form a parliamentary commission to draft proposals for handling the property of political parties and public organisations. The proposals will be submitted for the consideration by the republican parliament at a later date.

The session approved a statement on the restitution of the status of the Catholic Church in Lithuania, which declared that the state recognised the right of the Church to independently deal with its internal affairs.

The session will continue its work on Wednesday.

Communique on Lithuanian Economic Situation

LD1206223490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Lithianian Government Communique on economic situation]

[Text] The power situation on the 55th day of Lithuania's economic blockade is to be regarded as stable. Both generators of the second set are operating at the Ignalina nuclear power station. The Lithuanian state regional power station, making use of natural gas supplied to it, is operating at the minimum regime.

Moral support from the European Nuclear Community is felt. A few days ago the Lithuanian minister of power engineering sent a message to this community informing it that the Soviet Union was making use of nuclear power for political ends.

At today's meeting of the government commission regulating economic situation permission was given to power industry workers to supply technological steam to some light industry enterprises.

Wishing to give maximum assistance to the solution of the blockade problems, some local government bodies applied to the state commission for permission to sell on their territories fuel for motor vehicles at commercial prices that are higher than those fixed by the Ministry of Economics. The state commission has drawn the attention of local governments to the fact that this problem is linked with the general urgent problem of prices in the republic. It will be solved soon by the state Antiblockade Commission.

Lithuanian Official Interviewed on Blockade

AU0706080690 Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP in Hungarian 4 Jun 90 pp 1,2

[Interview with Kazimieras Motieka, Lithuanian deputy president, by Peter G. Feher, in Budapest; date not given: "Independence Cannot Be Invalidated"]

[Excerpts] At the invitation of the Szeged organization of the Hungarian Democratic Forum, Kazimieras Motieka, one of the deputies of Lithuanian President Landsbergis, visited Hungary for a few days. We took advantage of his visit to ask him for an interview.

[Feher] We have received a lot of alarming news from Lithuania. What is your view on the severity of the current situation that has emerged as a result of the Soviet blockade?

[Motieka] Our economic situation is very bad. We already have more than 40,000 unemployed. Many factories and enterprises have closed down. Except for a few bus lines, the entire transportation system is down. There are big shortages in the supply of electric power too. This is particularly dangerous because we also have a nuclear power station in Lithuania which needs a steady supply of electric power in order to operate safely.

Despite the difficulties, the Lithuanian people are ready to suffer even more sacrifices. Many people are working in the fields and are gathering wood in the forests. Energy consumption is strictly controlled. The most important task now is to enable the free flow of energy into Lithuania from the RSFSR, [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Poland, and the Ukraine.

The Soviet Government has placed a ban on the trade among the various republics because Lithuania could pay with food supplies for the mineral oil, natural gas, and electric power supplied from other republics. I recently spoke on the telephone with Vilnius, the site of the Sajudis Congress held on 2 June, and they were very glad to hear about the democratic elections in the RSFSR, namely about Boris Yeltsin's election as president. Yeltsin met with Landsbergis a few days ago and recognized the justified demands of the Lithuanians. [passage omitted]

[Feher] Do you see any chances of a compromise solution with the Soviet Union? Some opinions say that the blockade cannot be maintained indefinitely.

[Motieka] Naturally, Lithuania is striving to achieve compromise and we have repeatedly expressed our position. However, Gorbachev does not want to consider our opinion. He demands that we invalidate our declaration of independence. Nobody can expect this from the Lithuanian parliament, because, if we did that, we would return to the Soviet Union as a regular member republic and the original situation would be restored.

[Feher] What support do you expect from the new Hungarian leadership during your talks here?

[Motieka] We will accept any support now, given our current situation. We primarily need medicine and various consumer goods. We are ready to negotiate with Hungary on a commercial basis. Some Hungarian trucks loaded with supplies arrived in Lithuania recently. I would like to make use of this opportunity to thank you for the support you have given us so far.

Lithuanian Disdain for Economic Reality Criticized

PM0706135390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[M. Gurtovoy report under the rubric "Economics": "Can Freedom be a Freeloader? Charity Instead of a Torch. What the Proprietor Will Vote For. Prudence Is the Child of the Market"]

[Text] Vilnius-Kaunas-Mazeikiai-Gargzdai—Nowadays it is the rule in Lithuania to divide up the mass media into "friends" and "enemies." It is hard not to be ironical about such a primitive division that rules out any objective position. Particularly when the "Kremlin yes-men" are joined by the West German newspaper UNSERE ZEIT, which dared to write: "Nationalist slogans may distract the population but you cannot feed people with them."

"Did you really not realize the extent to which the Lithuanian economy is bound up with the union economy? What economic model were you constructing when you declared secession?"

I put those questions to Bronislav Zaikauskas, economic adviser to the present Lithuanian Government.

"It was thought," Zaikauskas said, "that without changing our former suppliers of raw materials, electricity, and fuel we could actively get involved with Western technology and, making use of the cheap and relatively skilled labor available from local specialists, produce goods up to world market standards."

But, as far as I understand it, all this was based on Lithuania's economic autonomy, which was approved two years ago in both Vilnius and Moscow. And Feliks Kshanas, government adviser on economic reform, confirmed the correctness of my understanding. There was nothing new in the economic platform of a "separate Lithuania." While Lithuania was part of the Union this plan was entirely acceptable to us—it was a division of labor "within the family." In the event of secession it becomes obvious speculation on absurdly low oil, metal, and cotton prices... It is far more advantageous to pay R150 for a tonne of metal from the Urals than to pay 600 marks for the West German equivalent.

It was on this basis that it was planned to obtain certain advantages in order to break into the world market.

Incidentally, even not particularly ethical calculations like these—to put it mildly—are utopian. As A. Tarasyavichus, Lithuanian deputy minister of material resources, said, most Lithuanian industrial output is made up of components for end products produced in the Union. They are hardly likely to be needed by anyone beyond the Union's borders. This means that economic restructuring, which would require enormous funds, would be needed. Where will that money come from? Here hopes were pinned on Lithuania being generously paid in freely convertible currency for its confrontation with the Union.

Odes are now being penned in Lithuania in praise of the parliamentarians' valor. Majestic paintings will probably not be long in coming either. But if a local Delacroix wants to realistically depict local freedom, he won't need a torch. The hand will be outstretched for charity.

But let us return to the office of B. Zaikauskas, government adviser on economic questions. He believes that Lithuania's political radicalism has been caused by the economic conservatism of the Union.

The fact that the resolution on Lithuania's economic autonomy was in no way implemented moved events in this direction, in Zaikauskas' opinion. The republic's economic life has continued to be controlled and directed by the center in recent years. Political dissatisfaction was not nullified by the economy. And, as he put it, "we have now forced Moscow to take us seriously."

It seems to me that the decision of the "nighttime parliament"—as the act of secession from the USSR is called here—is reminiscent more of the detonator of a political explosion than of a catalyst of economic processes. But we cannot fail to agree that the declared, but in no way implemented, economic autonomy has also played a sinister role in this area. If we look into it, it could not have been implemented. There could not even be any serious discussion about any kind of autonomy at a time when the central departments' monopoly has not been destroyed—even legislatively—when horizontal market ties have not been created, when retail trade has not replaced distribution, when there is no right to enterprise, and when there is no stock market.

Incidentally, this administrative-edict system cannon is already, it seems, firing all over the place at random. After all, the economic sanctions applied to Lithuania have also partly remained on paper. A number of departments have obtained an unprecedented decision from the union Council of Ministers that 46 enterprises in the republic will be supplied with everything they need as if nothing had happened.

Right, let's suppose that the supporters of Lithuanian secession are at least partly motivated by the noble ideals of combating an obsolete economic system. But surely, as F. Kshanas, Lithuanian government adviser on economic reform, said, this very reform is now virtually dead here. Admittedly, today the parliament is examining the possibility of turning peasants into landowners in the full sense of the word, but the talk about the privatization of industry has died away and the first stock exchange is opening in Chelyabinsk, not Kaunas. The monopoly of local ministries in distributing resources has become even firmer than before and is almost total.

Probably things could not be otherwise. A violent political decision adopted contrary to economic laws (as Academician Vilkas put it: "We jumped naked into a bed of nettles") cannot be on friendly terms with the economy. Violence is inevitable. It seems that the people with the "snazzy vests" who are now in power want to rule, distribute, and suppress no less than the recent rulers in their office-workers' three-piece suits. Why should they create an economic "autopilot" to attempt to change their fatal course? They have simply seized the levers of economic management and, thanks to their lack of experience and incompetence, are wielding them probably even more clumsily than the former commanders. And, whereas previously you could at least sound off about the oppressive bureaucratic command system, now you have to keep your mouth shut! The new rulers as yet have no opportunity to physically suppress malcontents, as is the case in a real totalitarian state. A machinery for the moral suppression of dissidents has been put into action. People are labeled "enemies of the nation" or "Kremlin accomplices" in response to the slightest criticism. And, thanks to these efforts, the moral climate in the republic is starting to be reminiscent of the campaign launched in our country in the late thirties.

The editorial office at Vilnius' VECHERNIYE NOVOSTI is getting letters naming people who are "bending over backward to harm Lithuania" and giving the addresses of those who are hiding gasoline and groats. And "if the editorial office does not expose these wreckers, it means that wreckers have taken up residence there too."

These refrains are agonizingly familiar to us. And, many people believe, the notes are written from above. In late May Lithuanian radio, abusing everything Soviet, suddenly started talking about Pavlik Morozov as a hero who placed the interests of the nation above his family interests.

Those who are now in power in Lithuania have skillfully exploited economically enslaved people's dissatisfaction with their situation, and skillfully channeled this dissatisfaction in the nationalist direction they need. And now, realizing that there are more and more well-springs feeding this dissatisfaction, they are scared that they will soon fall victim to it themselves. Hence the passion for "emergency measures" and the sustained press campaign. I recall that even in the most hidebound Suslov period the Lithuanian newspapers stood out among a generally doleful chorus with their freedom-loving voices. Today they are reminiscent of our fifties-era rayon newspapers. You can even read articles stating that, inspired by the ideas of national independence, worker K. manages to make do without the enemy's electricity. It turns out that he works his machine tool by hand...

What is the next stage—a collection of Landsbergis' apothegms?

Now let us imagine that the Lithuanian events were developing against the backdrop of market relations. Then the people voting for secession would not be serfs of the state economy who blamed their servitude on their membership of the Union, but free producers and shareholders. The people voting would not be pawns in a faceless state mechanism who live by the philosophy "the worse things are, the better" but active components and creators of the economy at the level of the primary, basic tier, who could not fail to take an interest in future economic realities. These realities can be learned from the Estonian Academician M. Bronshteyn, who has spent time carefully studying the opportunities for Baltic exports to the FRG and France. And he confirmed the conclusions of other serious academics—it would take at least another 10 years to sell even raw materials on that market. Industry is wholly uncompetitive. Western firms would crush it in the space of a few months were borders to be opened. And voters would have to think again. After all, it would not be some kind of state plant that would be destroyed, but the enterprise that you own, in whose shares you have invested your own money.

But let's abandon the conditional tense—so useful for daydreams. Let's leave the subjunctive and focus on the present day—which differs so much from what we would wish for.

Thus, the Union proposed that Lithuania at least suspend its unconstitutional decree. Sober-minded people (and there are many in Lithuania, although their voices have been stifled) believe that this period should come about next year, when, let us hope, the Union market will start to take shape. After all, when it is set up economic sanctions will not be needed against anyone. Republics in the Union will have advantages on prices and tariffs. Moreover, the market will be protected. And those weak members—which is what all our republics are without exception—need that protection oh so much. After all, even the all-European market has been forced to protect itself against Japan and the United States.

And in general, as Academician S. Shatalin believes, there will be a major decrease in the numbers wishing to leave such a market. Competitive output cannot be produced without scientific and technical potential. And, to that end, we need to have a scientific mass that is not less than a critical mass. That is, we need mutual assistance and the acquisition of knowledge, ideas, and resources. It is easier to implement medical and ecological programs together. For instance, we struck oil near Palanga in 1983. Then, under pressure from the "Greens," drilling was stopped. The union could afford such "luxuries." But now the wells have been demothballed. For the sake of hundreds of thousands of tonnes of oil a year Lithuania is putting a unique resort region at risk. And the "Greens" no longer dare even to squeak under the "democratic" iron heel.

There is one other aspect too. Last Saturday a "Sajudis" spokesman on the "German Wave" program said that Lithuanians are taking to the lifeboats so as not to be dragged under by the sinking ship of the Soviet empire. I even heard people in Vilnius say that "we don't give a damn about the effect of Lithuania's secession on the political position in the union." This is dangerously naive. I would make so bold as to pay tribute to the fashion for sinister forecasts. It should not be forgotten that the conservatives have now abandoned their plans to save the union. On the contrary, slogans are being openly voiced about a "separate Russia," which nobody will prevent from traveling the totalitarian nonmarket path. And Russian-speaking people could support precisely these ideas if they start being driven back into Russia by fire, sword, or law by republics which want to live in isolation. I know at first hand what people who have been offended for nothing and who have innocently lost their homes are capable of. I saw it this winter in Baku. After all, it was the refugees from Armenia who set the tone of the pogroms there. And Russia, chockablock with people forced to recognize that might is right and thirsting for opinions that connect their disorganization with the reforms in general, will very soon be forced to take the well-trodden path to dictatorship.

And, having used its iron first to establish a starvation regime, it will not look kindly on neighbors who might seem less hungry.

Belligerent nationalism can never avoid territorial claims. Even in Lithuania, which usually calls itself a tadpole between giants, I can read in EKHO KAUNASA about the great state stretching from the Visla to the Neva, and the same publication contemptuously calls the Swedes mere fish-eaters. Yet how many opportunities could Russian history adduce in justification of expansion if people so desired... And it would not be the ill-considered recent tour of the streets of Vilnius by armored vehicles, which left behind just fumes and ridicule... Nor would it be the semi-farcical raid by assault troops on local bughouses which scared the local nutcases... No. With its clattering caterpillar tracks, the output of "Uralvagonzavod" will prove its competitiveness for the umpteenth time. And this is a threat not only and not so much to Lithuania as to all of us—and Russia above all.

We all have a common destiny whether we like it or not. Either a common market or a common camp. There is no middle way.

But let's keep our fingers crossed and hope that it does not come to that. And let's return to Vilnius today. Here, unfortunately, people are looking for ruses rather than mutually acceptable compromises. The main point at stake today is direct ties. That was the pretext fronting the operation to exchange meat for fuel in various parts of the country. And, after obtaining the fuel oil, they are trying to defame the central government and explain the separate deal as being the result of an oil-producing region's disagreement with Moscow and its solidarity with the Lithuanian insurgents.

Everything is more simple, of course. There is no market. Everything is distributed. And suddenly "free" meat appeared. It is not possible to sell oil in a civilized way and buy Australian lamb, for instance. But it is possible to barter.

But is there actually a key to the Lithuanian door, which trapped so many fingers when it slammed shut?

However events develop now, and whatever the readiness for compromise or—on the contrary—inflexibility displayed by politicians in Moscow or Vilnius, everything that I have seen, heard, and read in Lithuania today seems to entitle me to reply: "There is a key—the market."

I hope that the genetically sensible Balts will listen to their own economists, who joke bitterly that the only local and undoubtedly competitive product is their blonde lovelies. But, joking apart, there is little chance that the new relationship with the union will be—as the Estonian newspapers put it—a "love match." It is probably time to put a stop to the protracted seance of political spiritualism that is poisoning our mutual relations with the stench of Molotov-Ribbentrop and to learn a lesson from the Finnish phenomenon. After all, the Finns, overlooking former insults, organized an "arranged marriage" with their former adversaries.

Prudence is both the child of the market and a necessary condition for it. So if I had to weigh up just what is preventing relations being normalized and brought into line with civilized norms, I would say it was primarily not national ambition or political dilettantism, but the lack of a market.

Lithuanian Parliament Moves To 'Privatize' Land

PM0706095990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[K. Ustsila report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "To Whom Should the Land Belong?"]

[Text] Deputies from the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet paid particular attention last week to the discussion of the basic principles of the land reform planned in the republic.

The main direction of reform under the draft law lies in transferring land and property belonging to currently operating agricultural enterprises to private use, that is, returning land free of charge to its former owners or their successors, selling land and property belonging to farms, and other, no less radical measures toward the privatization of the agrarian sector of the economy. Certain deputies tried to reason with those determined to jump in right away and take hasty, controversial decisions. However, their arguments were rejected by the majority in the parliament, which belongs to "Sajudis."

Lithuanian Military Society Chief Challenged

PM1206122590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Second Edition p 3

[Report by Captain Second Rank V. Gromak: "Further On There Is More"]

[Text] Vilnius—A complex situation has now taken shape in the republic's DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy]. Until recently the republic's leadership respected Major General G. Taurinskas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] DOSAAF. But when the general categorically rejected the demand to break off ties with the USSR DOSAAF Central Committee and punctiliously fulfilled the USSR president's 21 March 1990 decree on the temporary confiscation of sports guns with a view to preventing their possible use by extremists, he was called an enemy of the people from the parliament rostrum.

Further on there is more. They decided to get rid of the obstinate Lithuanian general who did not recognize laws contradicting the USSR Constitution. A DOSAAF Central Committee Plenum was convened (the chairman of the Lithuanian SSR DOSAAF Central Committee was not even informed). At the plenum A. Kayris, released into the reserve several years ago for bribery, was elected chairman of the alternative society.

At a sitting of the republic's Council of Ministers Major General G. Taurinskas directly stated that the plenum decision was illegal, since of 98 members 58 did not attend it.

"'If you can prove it,' I was told by deputy Z. Vayshvila, 'we shall repeal the decision,'" General Taurinskas says. "And this was stated in the presence of Deputies Pechelyunas and Ozolas."

The major general showed me a file with papers. It contains 58 individual written statements from members of the Lithuanian SSR DOSAAF Central Committee and a letter addressed to R. Ozolas, deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, requesting that the legal powers of the republic's DOSAAF be restored and that measures be taken to ensure that the republican bank recognize the signatures of the general and the chief accountant.

This appeal was investigated by V. Kumpa, chief of the Council of Ministers legal department. And he drew a "profound" conclusion: "From the materials submitted by G. Taurinskas it is impossible to conclude that the plenum was invalid." Ozolas included his own decision: "I agree." Now a demand is being made that the general hold a new plenum so that the 58 people can verbally confirm their written statement at it.

Is that not paradoxical? And this is being demanded by those who are speaking out loud about their struggle against bureaucracy and their desire to build a rule-of-law state. In actual fact by demonstrating the best forms of bureaucracy and dictatorship.

Lithuanian Council Opposes Vilnius Polish Rayon

LD0606203190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] A meeting of the presidium of the Lithuanian Supreme Council took place today under the chairmanship of the deputy chairman of the Supreme Council, Kazimieras Motieka.

The presidium thoroughly examined the documents adopted by the Vilnius Rayon self-government council on 24 May 1990. It was noted that the adopted decisions on the creation of the Vilnius Polish National Rayon are contrary to the interests of the Lithuanian republic and the provisions of the temporary basic law. The presidium is of the opinion that the problems of the Vilnius and other rayons in Lithuania can be solved only by joint efforts of the bodies of the republic and local government, public institutions, and of the citizens.

The presidium proposed that these problems and the situation in the southeastern part of Lithuania should be discussed at a plenary session of the Supreme Council, and ways should be found together with the government and self-governed bodies to solve these problems.

The presidium listened to a report by the permanent representative of the Lithuanian republic at the USSR Council of Ministers, Egidijus Bickauskas, about his

work, examined the agenda of the Supreme Council, and discussed some other urgent problems.

'Depolitization' Curbs CPSU 'Influence'

LD1306084390 Moscow TASS in English 0823 GMT 13 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Serafim Bykhun]

[Text] Vilnius June 13 TASS—The wave of "depolitisation," which swept Lithuania's state institutions with the blessing of the republic's parliament, has deprived the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) of all influence in several important areas. This primarily refers to party organizations in republican ministries of the interior and justice, in courts and some other bodies.

"The communists have retained their party organisation in the procurator's office," its secretary, senior justice councellor Ivan Shashkov, told TASS. "Today it has a membership of over 60. But it is the only party organisation in the Lithuanian prosecuting system."

"The work of our party organisation," Shashkov said, "has been complicated by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet's decision of April 3 to discontinue the activities of the prosecutor's offices of the USSR and the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. An independent procurator's office of the Lithuanian Republic was set up.

"It watches over the observance of laws issued by the new government. Moreover, on April 6 the Lithuanian Council of Ministers ordered all ministries, departments, urban and rural self- government bodies to disregard the demands of the prosecutor's office of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic and banned all contacts with its representatives, since they allegedly had no powers on the republic's territory."

Organs of the Lithuanian Interior Ministry also refuse to obey orders of the procurator's office of the Lithuanian Soviet Republic. According to Shashkov, the procurator's office is unable to ensure the constitutional rights of Soviet citizens increasingly persecuted by nationalistic and extremist forces.

The following facts show what all this leads to. The number of crimes committed in the republic during the first four months of this year has grown by 21.5 per cent as compared to the same period of last year and the number of particularly grave crimes—by 37.3 per cent. The share of undisclosed offences amounts to 74.5 per cent.

Shashkov believes "depolitisation" is nothing but an outright claim for power which, moreover, has an obviously nationalistic slant. It is fraught with far reaching consequences not only for many thousands of people, but for perestroyka itself.

Estonian Bank President on Proposed Currency

LD1006031290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0418 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Tallinn, 9 June, ETA correspondent Ruta Pels writes:

The Estonian krona, which is planned to be put into circulation at the end of this year, will not automatically improve the standard of living of the republic's population, according to Reyn Otsason, president of the Bank of Estonia. However, it will provide a guarantee that the standard of living of the inhabitants of the republic will grow in proportion to their labor.

The head of the bank regards the chief danger to Estonia's own currency to be the budget deficit. This year it amounts to around R100 million, and this is a highly significant sum for Estonia. Legislation must also set credit limits for local budgets and legislative acts must be adopted to set out the procedure for the use of the receipts from the sale of state assets. The measures adopted regarding the interests of private agencies will, according to Reyn Otsason, be able to close off inflationary channels within the republic. As regards taking the krona outside the republic and subsequently using it toward payments to the republic for gold, hard currency and goods, this will also be limited by legislation. A limit on the amount of rubles that visitors to the republic will be able to exchange for kronas will enable the present formalities—in particular, cards and coupons in shops—to be dispensed with. The exchange rate will be determined by supply and demand and the prices of goods, and will not of course always be 1:1.

"For inter-republican payments, the ruble will continue to be used even following the introduction of our own money," says Reyn Otsason. "This is in fact laid down in the USSR law on the economic independence of the Baltic republics."

U.S. Senator Meets With Estonian Leaders

LD0606231190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] TAllin, 6 Jun (TASS)—U.S. Senator Dennis DeConcini has to a large extent altered his, as he put it, "one-sided idea" of events in this Soviet Baltic republic following his visit to Estonia.

Senator Dennis DeConcini has been in Estonia in connection with Monday's opening of the Estonian-American Chamber of Commerce. However, to a significant extent he is—as he himself confided to journalists—interested in the reason for the dissatisfaction of the Russophone population with the processes taking place in the republic at present.

In the West, and in the United States in particular, the view of events held by the supporters of the state

independence of Estonia is more familiar. For that reason, during his stay in Tallin Dennis DeConcini wanted to hear the "other side."

A meeting with two deputies of the Estonian Supreme Soviet, Vladimir Lebedev and Aleksey Zybin, who support the preservation of the Soviet Federation, took place behind closed doors. The senator declined to comment on the results of the meeeting, but, according to a report on Tuesday in the Estonian newspaper PAEVALEHT, in a private conversation with a member of the present Estonian leadership, the senator admitted that the meeting with deputies Lebedev and Zybin shook some of his ideas about the internal political situation in Estonia.

Defense Organization Reestablished in Latvia

LD1206211590 Moscow TASS in English 2055 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev]

[Text] Riga June 13 TASS—The registration of members of an Ayzsarg organisation began in one of the districts of the republic's capital on Tuesday night.

The paramilitary organisation of Ayzsargs ("Defenders" in Lettish) existed in bourgeois Latvia from 1919 to 1940. Its members (of whom there were 68,000) actively participated in the 1934 coup d'etat, when Karlis Ulmanis came to power, and performed police functions.

ATMODA, newspaper of the popular front, explains the resumption of Ayzsarg activities by the "unstable situation, a sharp increase in the number of breaches of the public order and the need for self-defense".

The text of Ayzsarg oath includes the following words: "I vow not to spare my energies and life for the restoration of the Latvian Republic and defence of its independence".

During World War Two, Nazis formed more than twenty police battalions from among Ayzsargs for the eastern front. The German secret service left about 5,000 Ayzsargs in the Soviet army's rear areas with an assignment to stage sabotage acts.

Now that non-indigenous people constitute the majority of the personnel of militia bodies, it is necessary to have Latvia's own structures for the maintenance of order, the organisers of the restoration of this organisation believe.

Along with the Ayzsarg organisation, detachments of the "Guardians of Order" are being simultaneously established at state level. These detachments now include more than 5,000 members already. Both the former and the latter will have no weapons.

The emergence of such formations raises quite understandable concern among the republic's residents, primarily among non-Lettish population.

A desire to replace the legally existing law and order maintenance bodies by new ones which are being created under the auspices of anti-Soviet forces has been described by Latvian Communist party chief Alfred Rubiks as an attempt to destabilise and aggravate the situation in Latvia.

Under these conditions, it is difficult to believe the new government's assurances about a desire to achieve civil peace and concord in Latvia.

'Depoliticization' Aimed Against Communist Party

PM1206125590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Dispatch by correspondent G. Kuchina: "Economy Awaits Its Turn. Seventh Week of Work by Latvian Supreme Soviet Begins"]

[Text] Riga—Deputies have been issued with a draft resolution on terminating the activity of parties and other sociopolitical organizations in organs of state management and law enforcement organs. To be more precise, there are several different versions of the document, but they are similar to one another. While parliament has been getting ready for the debates, they have flared up outside its walls. Some see the diversity of parties as an impediment to coordinated, objective work by state establishments and enterprises. Consequently, they believe that there should be no cells, primary organizations, or meetings in these places. Everything should be suspended until a special law has been adopted to regulate the activity of political organizations. Others, including V. Dauksis, the republic's prosecutor, adhere to a different point of view. In an interview with a youth newspaper he said: Depoliticization is now a struggle against the Latvian Communist Party. Indeed, if you consider that the Council of Ministers is now composed solely of people who support the People's Front, how can there be any talk of depoliticization? When the Council of Ministers says that it has become apolitical, that is fiction, of course. After all, the Latvian People's Front is still a sociopolitical organization.

Deputies are reminding people with increasing persistency that it is time to come down from the political heights and get to grips with the "burning" problems on which people's living standard depends. Rural areas are requesting that an act on agrarian reform be adopted by the end of the summer, hoping for the opportunity to broadly discuss it beforehand. Industrial workers are expecting a package of laws. People are concerned about the question of pensions. In order to ease the unrest, several deputies proposed that the union law be ratified. Representatives of the majority faction did not agree with this. As far as they are concerned, the republic needs its own law, and they are convinced that it will be better than the union law. Consequently, the Latvian People's Front faction refused to take part in the vote, thereby deciding the fate of the proposal.

The local press cannot leave the [ration] "coupon" subject alone. It has been estimated that, with the introduction of the coupon system for the sale of a number of products, each citizen of Riga can consume

up to 16.6 grams of groats and flour and up to four grams of pasta per day. One deputy who asked a question at the session described these norms as humiliating. The trade minister explained that at present this is the only way to contain panic buying. Although he agreed that it is not fair, of course, that many who have turned their homes into warehouses for perishable foods will soon start to throw this food away, while others, either less provident or more composed, will be left with miserable amounts.

The government session adopted a resolution on selling goods at auction and at commercial prices. The list of goods has turned out to be a long one.

So the economy is knocking on parliament's door. When will it start to crowd in on politics? I put this question to several deputies. They shrugged their shoulders in response and said: "Our agendas are unpredictable."

Latvian Party Congress Proceedings Reported

PM1206105590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Correspondent O. Meshkov report: "Change of Tactics. Notes from the Latvian Communist Party Congress"]

[Text] Riga—The second sitting of the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress was held. The time span separating it from the first sitting—in early April—is not all that long, but think of the numerous important events that have occurred since then! The election campaign is over and the Latvian Communist Party, having lost to the People's Front, has to all intents and purposes found itself in opposition. The conditions governing the Communist Party's existence and activity have become much more complex. The Supreme Soviet, having adopted a declaration of independence, has already declared that the use of newspaper and journal publishing houses by communists is unlawful, while work is under way to prepare draft parliamentary decisions to depoliticize state management organs and a law on parties and public organizations under which the Latvian Communist Party will be essentially outlawed.

The strange political situation prevailing in the republic could be sensed during the second sitting itself. Delegates had to amend the previously planned order of work since Latvian Radio broadcast the sitting's proceedings only between 1000 hours and midday. The Credentials Commission's report was postponed until later so that the two main reports could be broadcast without fail. People must know how communists appraise the situation, how they perceive the future, and what goals they set themselves.

A report "On the Latvian Communist Party's Tactics in the Contemporary Sociopolitical Conditions in the Republic" was delivered by A. Rubiks, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee. He used the words trial by combat to describe the time period since the first sitting which, as it is well known, saw a split developing within the Union's oldest Communist Party. How was this grim trial passed by communists who remained loyal to the socialist ideals, how did they behave in the conditions of the unprecedented "crusade" declared against the party? The following main conclusion can be drawn: The hopes that the Communist Party would fade and cease to exist failed to materialize.

Here are some data from the report: At the beginning of the year, there were 176,600 persons holding party membership cards; this figure has declined by only 10,300 by now, while all party structures have been restored in cities and rayons. The party is alive, the party is functioning.

It also has allies in the struggle. This was how the speaker described the International Front of Working People, the republic's OSTK [United Council of Labor Collectives], and the recently created Republican Committee for Defense of the Constitution and Citizens' Rights in the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. Together with them, the Communist Party is now engaged in explanatory and organizational work to collect signatures in favor of a republican referendum to answer the question: Will Latvia remain within the USSR? The speaker analyzed in detail the various possible options for further development of events and submitted for discussion options for the party's future conduct and struggle tactics. But the main point—and this was noted by many speakers—is that the Latvian Communist Party has switched from passive defense to active offensive actions.

"Our Central Committee recently became more active and more purposeful," A. Grigoryev, railroad engineer from Daugavpils, said in his debate speech. "The results can already be seen: We succeeded in gaining victory in the final stage of elections to the Supreme Soviet, our parliamentary faction 'Equality' was created at the Central Committee's initiative and is functioning well, much is being done to enliven the party press' work. Had the former leadership held onto such offensive positions, we would not have been an opposition party today."

But whose policy is really in line with the interests of the broad masses of working people? Answering this question, the main speaker adduced weighty arguments to prove that the people's genuine interests are expressed by the Latvian Communist Party and not by the People's Front or the separatists who attach priority to the nation's rights over human rights. And yet there is nothing loftier than human rights—the rights of each and every man! The Latvian People's Front is hatching plans whereby, following Latvia's secession from the USSR, homes and land will be handed over to their previous owners and residence qualifications will be introduced. For their part, the communists declare: The real masters of the land ought to be they who work it. The people's policy of the Communist Party will certainly bring new people to its ranks. But painstaking educational and organizational work is needed in order to ensure that this process unfolds more swiftly.

"Unfortunately, the party now has few young members," Scientific Associate Ju. Purmals declared at the congress. "Just look at the average age of our congress delegates—

47 years. Yesterday, the republican Komsomol [Communist Youth League] conference held in this very hall, adopted a decision to change the republican Komsomol's name, now it is called Latvian Young People's League for Progress. Fine, as long as matters go no further than this change of name. I believe that we need to form our own young people's organization upholding the socialist ideals, it is necessary to engage in more active and more persuasive explanatory work among young people. They are, after all, our reserve. And the main point is not to deviate from this rule: Don't boss young people!"

The idea that the party's main task now is to gain the broadest possible and most reliable support, to gain the confidence of the masses, ran right through the main report. Delegates agreed and, in their speeches, strove to concretize this task and examined various aspects of the problem. For example, Ju. Beljavnieks, director of "Madliena" sovkhoz [state farm], spoke of the need for constructive work in the conditions of opposition and unfailing defense of the indigenous nation's interests without, of course, infringing the interests of all the other residents of the republic.

Many speakers supported the main speaker's idea that the party as a whole and each and every communist must prove by deeds that they are defenders of the working people's interests. Attention was sharply focused on the following point: Members of the CPSU working on soviets at any level have no right to vote for anti-people and anticonstitutional laws and decisions. Unfortunately, such instances have occurred. In this context, the demand to retain the principle of democratic centralism in party life was most resolutely expressed at the congress.

"We cannot manage without democratic centralism," A. Ozolins, worker at the Madona motor vehicles transport enterprise, said. "After all, we don't want to be a parliamentary party, we want to be a militant organization operating among the masses. Not a political club but a disciplined and organized organization. Therein lies our strength. But now the emphasis is placed on the word 'democratic' rather than on centralism as in the past."

It is noteworthy that many of those who are now advocating democratic centralism were skeptical about this principle just two months ago. People have realized: There can be no success in the conditions of a multiparty system without reliably organized work. Incidentally, the Latvian People's Front sharply criticized communists for their commitment to this principle during the election campaign but, in its daily work, the front's leadership demanded unconditional obedience to directives issued from above.

The congress discussed the question of the Communist Party's parliamentary activity. Different views were expressed. International Front Chairman I. Lopatin, for example, believes that the faction should not work in a parliament whose election involved breaches of the Law on Elections, a parliament which takes the liberty of violating the country's Constitution. But this view was not generally supported. It is necessary, the delegates decided, to continue to act in parliament, to submit alternative drafts, and to expose the demagogic and anti-people approaches toward the problems' solution in speeches.

O. Potreki, secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, delivered a report on the Latvian Communist Party's attitude toward the draft CPSU platform and statute. Many interesting proposals were made from the rostrum during the discussion of this question. Emphasis was placed on the idea that it is necessary to aim for utmost autonomy for the republican Communist Party. Then its ranks will swell, the party will be joined by those who have not yet made their final decisions.

By-elections of Central Committee members were held. There was a secret ballot to elect delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress. G.P. Razumovskiy, candidate member of the politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is among them.

Report on 7 June Latvian Party Plenum

LD0706114190 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 2000 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] A plenum of the Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee took place today in Riga. The question on the materials of a regular sitting of the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of Latvia was examined. The plenum accepted the basic outline of a draft report on the tactics of the Communist Party of Latvia in the present sociopolitical situation and a draft information on the CPSU Central Committee platform for the 28th Congress of the CPSU. Alfreds Rubiks and Ojars Potreki are charged with the task of delivering this at the session.

The plenum confirmed a proposal on the agenda of the regular session of the congress. It is envisaged to elect the delegates to the 28th Congress of the CPSU, and also the remaining members of the Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee, as well as the party's central control and auditing commission.

The plenum also adopted an appeal from the Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee to the heads of the republic's enterprises and organizations, and communists and non-party persons.

Gorbunov Meets U.S. Leningrad Consul General

LD0706113390 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 7 Jun 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program; report attributed to INTERFAX correspondent]

[Text] (Munroe Miles), U.S. consul general in Leningrad, who has arrived in Riga, has met Anatoliy Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet. They

exchanged views on the development of events in the Baltic region and on the U.S. attitude toward the processes taking place here.

People's Front Calls for Freedom of Movement

LD0706135490 Riga International Service in Latvian 1730 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] The People's Front of Latvia has called on the new government to cancel restrictions on the freedom of movement of foreign countries' citizens on Latvian territory that have been in force until now. Yesterday, at a session of the board of the People's Front Dome a submission addressed to the Council of Ministers of the republic was accepted, calling for the cancellation of prohibitions, dating back to the Cold War of the forties and fifties, on foreigners visiting the larger part of the territory of Latvia. It is requested that the question be discussed by 20 June, that is, by the start of the 20th General Song Festival, leaving in force only those restrictions that are binding on the residents of the republic of Latvia.

Godmanis Remarks on Interior Ministry Post

LD0806070790 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1022 GMT 4 June 90

[Remarks by Deputy Godmanis at the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga—live]

[Excerpts] Esteemed chairman, esteemed deputies, allow me to further, briefly, state my conviction. I believe that, like no one else in Latvia at the present time, I must feel the weight and the load of responsibility connected, well, to put it honestly, with all things, all spheres of life. In particular, two questions must, obviously, be stressed.

One question is connected with the internal affairs system. The other question, which we will probably have to debate later, shall we say, concerns forming correct relations with the army. I underline the word correct, bilateral. Therefore, I want to say only one thing before you vote. In particular, I want to turn to the opposition. In Latvia it has been like that, many know that, that the [words indistinct] attitude toward the militia, the attitude toward the internal affairs organs, to a lesser extent it has been legal, but to a larger extent it has been political. Should we now accept the opposition deputies' proposal of leaving the situation as it has been now, or should we take away the political stamp, the political burden off the internal affairs system. Or, shall we take into consideration that this burden lies on both sets of shoulders, as on the shoulders of the people. I mean those who are not in the internal affairs system, who regard and look upon the militia as something very much separated from the people and has something that has been literally incorporated or has in some way formed completed in a separated manner and has lived by itself?

On the other hand, this burden is upon the shoulders of that part of the people that serves in the internal affairs system. If we continue this situation, if we try to use the situation politically—speaking honestly I did not understand Deputy Shapovalov. I would understand if he had not worked in the internal affairs system at all—then one can obviously afford to say the words we heard here. However, if we hear them from a person who works in the internal affairs system, then I see only one thing: Continue, continue, and depoliticize. To continue the politicization of the internal affairs system is dangerous.

Not without reason Deputy Shapovalov indicated here that people in the internal affairs system had weapons. [passage omitted]

There must be concrete deeds here, here people must well and clearly feel they will not be released from work, as now these arguments are being made use of. You see, the interior affairs minister is replaced, and immediately such and such will be released. I think that the person whom I propose here, the esteemed Vaznis, who has worked for more than 30 years, well understands that it is not that simple. It is not that simple in this criminal atmosphere, to dismiss any from work because there is not one who will work in their place. One cannot come from the street and work in the militia. Here it must obviously be considered, when there is talk: How can one go into the militia without having served in the Army? Yes, one can go into the militia without having served in the Army, but to work in the militia one must learn for a time [how] to work there, so the person must go to militia school, but not directly into the militia.

Therefore, I want to say one thing. I was a little embittered by the speech of the opposition faction leader, who very exactly informed about my conversation with Bakatin. I do not know. There were only the two of us taking part in that conversation. [passage omitted] What kind of system do we adhere to? We will adhere to such a system. I am thinking of what the esteemed candidate Vaznis replied when asked a question of whether he, being minister of internal affairs, would fulfill political decisions. The reply was very exact. So then, those decisions which do not threaten, which do not threaten the life of the people, which do not threaten the normal life of people under the conditions of order, which ensure that people will be able to work normally and to develop normally. [sentence as heard] Those decisions, yes, but other political decisions from wherever they may come, the internal affairs system cannot fulfil. [Vaznis replied]. [passage omitted]

Latvia's Resolution on Press Ownership Deplored

PM0806084990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 90 First Edition p 2

[Dispatch by correspondent O. Meshkov: "Flouting the Right of Ownership"]

[Text] Riga—PRAVDA has already reported that the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has adopted a resolution "On The Return to the Latvian Republic of the Illegally Appropriated Property of Newspaper and Magazine Publishing Houses." And certain

deputies, speaking at the session, said that the Latvian Communist Party itself had allegedly encouraged the parliament to adopt this document by making the—in the parliamentarians' view—illegal decision to amalgamate the newspapers CINA and SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA and rejecting the independent Communist Party's claim to publish CINA.

Accusations were also heard from the parliamentary rostrum against the party apparatus, which, it was claimed, illegally took control 25 years ago of the publication of many republican newspapers and magazines, whose profits flowed into the party budget. Indeed, the creation of a party publishing system in Latvia was formalized by a Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Presidium resolution but actually done at the suggestion of the Latvian SSR State Committee for the Press. Two years later, when the USSR Council of Ministers decided to abolish its newspaper and magazine publishing house on an entirely legal basis, the publishing house was transferred to the jurisdiction of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and the CPSU Central Committee Administration of Affairs' Party Publishing Houses Production Department. So there was simply no expropriation or violation of the law.

Something else, however, is surprising: Why did the republic's Supreme Soviet consider it necessary to pass a verdict on this issue? After all, in any civilized society there is a division of power between the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary. Decisions about certain pieces of property fall within the purview of judicial organs alone! By adopting the aforesaid resolution, the republic's Supreme Soviet as it were predetermined the court's decision. But isn't this confusing, to put it mildly?

Many inhabitants of the republic are also confused about another—highly serious!—issue: The contradiction between the content of the 4 May declaration on Latvian state independence, which deemed the 1922 Constitution and its interpretation of the right of ownership to be valid, and this resolution is obvious even to the untrained observer. Certain Western radio stations have also been drawing attention to this contradiction, incidentally.

But how can peasant farmers and worker collectives who have leased enterprises and cooperative members fail to worry if the republic parliament creates such precedents with regard to owners? And we would stress yet again that this decision was not preceded by any judicial investigation or thorough elucidation of the essence and details of the matter. And isn't it surprising that all this took place in the presence and with the participation of the best and most qualified Latvian lawyers?

I think that the adopted resolution (I would note that the "Equal Rights" faction refused to take part in the vote on the document) is nothing other than an attempt to step up the pressure on the Latvian Communist Party and deprive it of its voice—the mass media. What will be the next target—the Political Enlightenment Center, the Party History Institute, or its archives building, which is under construction?

All owners are entitled to protect their property. Needless to say, the Latvian Communist Party does not waive that right. But, understandably, this is linked with the growth in the already considerable tension in the republic. A calm and balanced resolution of all issues around the negotiating table would be far more correct and sensible.

New Latvian Cultural Newspapers Published

LD1006173990 Moscow Maritime Service in Russian 1200 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Summary] The first issue of the new Latvian newspaper VCHERA I ZAVTRA published by the Latvian Cultural fund and the Latvian Russian Culture Society, has come out. It is a politically neutral publication which will write about cultural and historical matters.

The first issue of the new Latvian weekly V KRUGU SEMYI has been published in Riga. It is a politically neutral paper writing on a broad range of subjects—from cooking to nursery rhymes.

Baltic Council Issues Final Document

LD1206185490 Riga International Service in Latvian 1730 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Excerpt] At the beginning of the week, the U.S. consul in Leningrad visited Riga. He met Supreme Soviet chairman Anatolily Gorbunov and Foreign Minister Janis Jurkans. They discussed the situation in Latvia and in the Baltic region, as a whole, and also the U.S. Government's stance (?in connection with the) problems of this region.

But now a brief insight into the final document of the second meeting of the Baltic Council. The world's media have already reported the repeated invitation to the USSR president by the Baltic leaders to talks, in order to solve the conflict connected with the demand for restoring independence. After consultations in the economic sphere, a number of statements addressed to the countries of the world were adopted. Thus it has been stated that our states, ready to adhere to UN principles; at the same time expect that its member countries, when concluding international treaties, will take into consideration the sovereign rights and interests of the Baltic states.

A separate document expresses a readiness willingness to guarantee the human rights of all permanent residents of the Baltic republics and to sign the universal declaration of human rights, as well as other internationally recognized documents in this sphere.

In the course of the Baltic Council meeting, the drawing-up of the conception of a transitional period to be

offered to Moscow has advanced, noted Anatolily Gorbunov; the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the republic of Latvia, at the conclusion of the meeting. The leaders of the parliaments of the three states, in their turn, rejected the referendum on the question of the restoration of independence, demanded the USSR president. [passage omitted]

Report Claims Summit 'Freezes Status Quo'

PM0706135790 Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET in Swedish 6 Jun 90 p 8

[FINSKA NOTISBYRAN report: "Disappointment in the Baltic Region Over Summit"]

[Text] The superpower summit has made the Baltic republics' independence even more remote. The meeting also deepens the conflict between Moscow and the Baltic region, according to Estonian Minister Endel Lippmaa, who is visiting Finland.

Lippmaa is minister without portfolio in the Estonian government and is the minister responsible for the independence negotiations with Moscow.

The summit gave Gorbachev everything he had been hoping for, Lippmaa said. Decisions were postponed on all important issues: the military affiliation of a united Germany, the economic blockade of Lithuania—and possibly also of the two other Baltic republics—conventional arms reductions, and so on.

The person who has benefited most from the summit is Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov. He can continue to do what he has been doing: avoiding vital economic reforms and continuing to talk without acting, Lippmaa said.

"The summit freezes the status quo," the Estonian minister said.

In Lippmaa's view the election of Boris Yeltsin as president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic shows that the forces that support real perestroyka are as strong as those which want to preserve the empire.

"The summit gave support to the pro-empire forces in the Soviet Union," the Estonian minister pointed out. He said that naturally this does not promote the process aimed at correcting the injustices in Europe which date from World War II.

Lippmaa, who is a scientist and academician, is on a private visit to Finland. On Monday [4 June] he gave a lecture at the Nordic polymer conference at Helsinki University. The 59-year-old minister has been a key figure in Estonia's struggle for independence.

Lippmaa said that the Baltic republics cannot accept the demand for their declarations of independence to be put on ice or annulled. According to Lippmaa, such demands have been put forward not only by Gorbachev, but also by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker.

"Only new governments brought to power by pro-empire forces could accede to such demands," he said, pointing out that these forces have fewer than one-fifth of seats in the Estonian parliament. They have only a few representatives in the Lithuanian parliament, and in Latvia they have fewer than one-third of parliamentary seats, Lippmaa stressed.

"It is clear therefore that the demand cannot be forced through using parliamentary methods," he pointed out.

Lippmaa was part of the Estonian delegation led by Estonian President Arnold Ryuytel which had talks with the Soviet leadership at the end of April. According to Lippmaa, however, the talks with Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, and politburo member Aleksandr Yakovlev were almost totally fruitless.

At the talks Moscow refused to begin negotiations and to put the issue of independence on the agenda. Instead the question of independence was removed from the Supreme Soviet agenda.

The Soviet leadership stressed that Estonia has three paths to follow if it wants to achieve increased sovereignty within the Soviet Union: the renewal of its status as a federal state, confederation, or a Union agreement. All of these alternatives mean that the same constitution would obtain in all republics.

According to Lippmaa, the "sovereign" republics would be de facto provinces.

Lippmaa noted that Moscow refuses to recognize the fact that the Baltic republics have a full right to reestablish their independence, since they were occupied in 1939 [as published] and forcibly incorporated into the Soviet state.

According to Lippmaa, the new law on secession from the Soviet Union is not valid in the Baltic republics since the law was adopted after the three Soviet republics had decided on their declarations of independence. The former Soviet constitution stated that all republics were free to secede. The new law cannot be applied retroactively.

"And it is not correct to say that we are opposed to a referendum," Lippmaa said, referring to Moscow's demand that the Baltic republics must arrange a referendum on the question of independence.

"We are not opposed to a referendum. But the question that must be put is whether the people want association with the Soviet Union," the Estonian minister said.

Baltic Independence Referendums 'Not Required'

PM0806125190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Single Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Baltic Council Adopts Decision"]

[Text] Riga, 7 June—A session of the Baltic Council, which, as already reported, was constituted 12 May in Tallinn with the aim of "promoting the full reestablishment of state independence for the three republics," has been held in the Latvian health resort city of Jurmala.

The appeal to the parliaments and governments of the world adopted by the council expresses the conviction "that when international treaties concerning political and economic questions, and also the territory, waters, and airspace of the three Baltic states are being concluded, the sovereign rights and interests of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia will be taken into consideration."

In the opinion of Latvian Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Gorbunov, one of the most important features was the joint discussion at the Baltic Council of a concept for talks in Moscow, and of the economic and legal status of the transitional period envisaged in all three Baltic republics. The leaders of the Supreme Soviets of the three republics stated unanimously at a press conference that referendums on the question of the restoration of independence are not required, in their opinion. According to them, it is not obligatory to know the people's opinion on this subject.

It is interesting that, among the documents adopted here, there was also a statement "On the uniform principles of the legislative regulation of the rights and freedoms of permanent residents of the Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian republics."

The leaders of the three Baltic republics declared that "The basis of the legislative regulation of the rights and freedoms of permanent residents of their states is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Final Document of the Vienna meeting of representatives of the CSCE member states, and other internationally recognized agreements."

It emerges that Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia intend, when drafting their legislative acts, to be guided by the norms enshrined in these documents, including those which define the rights and freedoms of the citizens of foreign states and stateless citizens. Well, it remains only to hazard a guess about the logical connection between declaring rights and freedoms for all citizens to express their will, and completely ignoring the opinion of these people vis-a-vis the most important question—the path by which society is to develop in the future.

Baltic Industries Cooperate in Food Production

LD0606211990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1920 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Within the framework of the development of the Baltic market, the food industry workers of the three Baltic republics have signed a jointly evolved concept of cooperation. In Latvia, for example, there are capacities for additional processing of 50,000 tonnes of sugar beet for Estonia and Lithuania. And this can be from this year's harvest.

Now Latvia's neighbors do not need to expand their own production. Latvia will also process cocoa beans for the confectionery industry. Its partners will be supplied with 6,000 tonnes of the necessary semi-manufactured products annually.

Lithuania's food industry workers will produce additionally and supply to its neighbors 1,000 tonnes of bread kvass concentrate, 1,500 tonnes of toilet and 2,000 tonnes of household soap annually.

The Estonian colleagues will produce 4,000 tonnes of confectionary fats and margarine products, and also 4,300 tonnes of margarine for retail trade.

RSFSR

Opening Session of Supreme Soviet Reported

LD1306104490 Moscow TASS in English 1033 GMT 13 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow, June 13 TASS—Deputies at the session of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, which opened here today, are to elect the leadership of the two chambers of the parliament, form standing commissions and committees and appoint Russia's prime minister.

A meeting of the Council of the Republic was opened by Chairman of the republican parliament Boris Yeltsin. He described his meeting on Tuesday with President Mikhail Gorbachev.

"We met each other half-way" he said. "We shall be cooperating on a reciprocal businesslike basis as neither Russia can exist without the whole country, nor the country can exist without Russia."

Yeltsin suggested Deputy Alexandr Veshnyakov, secretary of the Arkhangelsk City Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, as candidate for the post of chairman of the Council of the Republic. Three other candidates were nominated. The candidates set out their programmes and answered questions.

A meeting of the Council of Nationalities of the Russian Parliament was opened by Yeltsin's first deputy, Ruslan Khasbulatov. He read a list of six candidates for the post of chairman of the chamber. They were nominated by delegations from national- territorial formations. Members of the Council of Nationalities suggested another candidate.

The candidates set out their programmes and answered questions.

The election of heads of the chambers are expected to be held later today.

Council Chairman Elected

LD1306113190 Moscow TASS in English 1108 GMT 13 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Vladimir Isakov, a 40-year old lawyer from Sverdlovsk, was elected chairman of the Council of the Republic of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. He won the elections against three other candidates. Aleksandr Veshnyakov, a party functionary from Archangelsk, was elected vice-chairman of the Council of the Republic. He was Isakov's rival in elections of the chamber's leader.

Congress Adopts Declaration of Sovereignty

LD1206104690 Moscow TASS in English 1039 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov, Kiril Dibrova, and Dmitry Polunin]

[Text] Moscow, 12 June TASS—The Russian Federation Congress of People's Deputies overwhelmingly passed a declaration of sovereignty today. A total of 907 deputies voted for, 13 against and nine abstained.

The document proclaims the Russian Federation, the largest Soviet republic, a sovereign state, declaring the supremacy of its laws on all its territory.

The Russian Federation retains the right to secede from the Soviet Union in accordance with procedures set in the Union treaty and associated laws.

The declaration guarantees the republic's territory rights and freedoms envisaged in the republican and Soviet Constitutions, as well as universally accepted international legal norms.

The republic "guarantees to all citizens of the Russian Federation, political parties, public and religious organisations and mass movements, acting within the framework of the Constitution, equal legal opportunities to participate in governing state and public affairs," it says.

The declaration proclaims the adherence of the Russian Federation to "the universally accepted principles of international law and its readiness to live in peace and accord with all nations and countries and do everything possible to avert international, ethnic and inter-republican conflicts, at the same time defending the interests of the peoples of Russia."

Constitutional Commission Formed

LD1206125990 Moscow TASS in English 1253 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksyonov and Dmitry Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 12 TASS—The Russian Congress of People's Deputies today formed a constitutional commission to draw up amendments to the republic's basic law.

The commission is headed by Russian Supreme Soviet Chairman Boris Yeltsin.

The congress today completed the first stage of its work with the adoption of a "declaration on the state sovereignty of the Russian Soviet Socialist Federative Republic."

This issue was considered at a briefing held by First Deputy Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov. He said that the declaration "laid the political platform for future constitutional changes." Khasbulatov emphasised that he sees the future of a sovereign Russia inside the Soviet Union.

The Russian Supreme Soviet will hold an organising session within the next three days. A total of 239 people have been elected to the Supreme Soviet out of the 252 members envisaged by the Constitution.

The parliamentarians will form the leadership of the two houses—the Council of the Federation and the Council of Nationalities—and standing committees and commissions.

The Russian congress will continue its work on Saturday.

PRAVDA on Adoption of Sovereignty Declaration

PM1306110590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Ye. Sorokin report: "The Finishing Line Is Near at the Russian Congress"]

[Excerpt] Yesterday's main event was undoubtedly the adoption of the declaration on Russia's sovereignty. I will recall that the actual idea of adopting this document "matured" during the first days of the congress and, it must be noted, was implemented fairly quickly given the unusual nature of the decision itself and the lack of necessary "studies." This, incidentally, was reflected in the procedure for adopting the declaration.

It took several days for the deputies to make this procedure both rigid and democratic. One can only regret that they did not immediately make use of the experience of the union parliament in elaborating important laws. But what's done is done, so to speak. The declaration has been adopted. Yesterday, the deputies voted on the last articles of the document, including Article 9, which was referred back for revision the night before. In particular, the document envisages the division of legislative, executive, and legal authority, which has been called the "most important principle of the functioning of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] as a rule-of-law state." The republic declared its adherence to universally recognized principles of international law and readiness to live in peace and concord with all countries and peoples and adopt all

measures necessary to prevent international, interrepublic, and interethnic conflicts, while at the same time defending the interests of the Russian peoples.

It is good that this important congress document contains words about "peace and concord." But how the deputies themselves lack these at times! Strange as it may seem, this was made apparent particularly forcefully yesterday, when the Constitutional Commission was being ratified. Scarcely anyone thought that the list of members would provoke such heated arguments and that Chairman B. Yeltsin would be repeatedly obliged to remind the speakers about deputies' ethics and appeal to them to trust one another more. [passage omitted]

Moscow TV Relays 12 June Congress Proceedings

Declaration Adopted

LD1206174490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1400 GMT on 12 June begins carrying a recorded relay of the 12 June proceedings at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow.

Yeltsin opens the session and deputies register. There is a quorum. Yeltsin says today the congress will sit till lunch time. Then it will be interrupted because the Supreme Soviet will sit. The Supreme Soviet will sit until Friday. The next session of the congress will be on Friday at 1000. It will work Friday, Saturday, and Monday. On Monday it will finish its work.

At 1405 GMT Yeltsin gives the congress 15 minutes for miscellaneous business.

At 1406 GMT Tikhomirov, coordinator of the Glasnost Group, makes an announcement: On 19 June the All-Russian party conference takes place and it is quite possible that the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA newspaper will be declared the paper of the Russian Party Central Committee. He has heard that a document has been signed in Gosteleradio that its structure is being changed so that there will be no funds for the setting-up of a Russian Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting. A commission has been set up on the media. He gives the names of more persons on the commission. He proposes including these comrades on the commission.

At 1408 GMT Yeltsin puts this proposal to the vote. Vote results: 790 for, 74 against, 22 abstentions. Adopted.

At 1410 GMT a deputy representing peoples of the north speaks for the miserable conditions of his people who do not benefit from the industrial exploitation of their territories. Damage to the environment and to pastures etc. is being caused. He cites an appeal from the Association of the Peoples of the North to recognize this organization and enact laws to protect them.

At 1414 GMT Yeltsin proposes that the Supreme Soviet examine the question.

At 1415 GMT Budovkin reports of complaints that Magadan television cut short the coverage of the congress and replaced it with a local program. He proposes that Gurevich's commission should examine them. If the commission finds Nenashev at fault Budovkin proposes an appeal be made to the USSR Supreme Soviet removing Nenashev from the post of head of Gosteleradio.

At 1420 GMT Deputy Plovutkin says yesterday a commission was created for coordinating liaison with the media. Regarding Gorbachev's request to the congress for an investigation into the incident on 9 June concerning a television interview with Yeltsin. Plovutkin asks the congress to adopt a resolution, asking the commission to investigate the statement by Gorbachev of 11 June and for the commission to declare the results of its investigation.

At 1426 GMT Yeltsin says a resolution is not necessary, but proposes a vote on the commission's investigation. Vote results: 779 for, 52 against, 20 abstentions. Adopted.

At 1428 GMT an unidentified deputy says Budovkin did not speak for the secretariat but for himself.

At 1429 GMT a speaker says that MOSKOVSKIY STROITEL carried an article blaming the Jews for the miserable state of Russia. It calls on Slavonic officers to intervene by force of arms. This is incitement to a clash between the Army and the people and to interethnic strife.

At 1430 GMT Deputy Borodin speaks about the question of the Yakutia drivers who were sacked.

At 1431 GMT Yeltsin says time is up. Agenda items only now. Yeltsin says we now go on the declaration on sovereignty, Article 13. He calls for a vote on this article. Vote results: 870 for, one against, eight abstentions. Adopted. Yeltsin asks Dmitriyev to speak on an amendment to the article.

At 1432 GMT Yuriy Yakovlevich Dmitriyev starts to speak on the amendment. He says he speaks as member of the editorial commission. He interprets Article 13 as meaning a division of the legislative and executive powers as a major principle of the functioning of RSFSR as a law-governed state. There should not be a combination of posts of heads of bodies of state power and government with any other paid post as head of a state body or party. And, in the course of 1991, the transition of the RSFSR to a presidential form of rule with direct elections of the president by the people by a referendum, should be ensured.

At 1433 GMT a speaker speaks against the amendment.

At 1435 GMT Yeltsin puts the Dmitriyev amendment to the vote. Vote results: 177 for, 699 against, 41 abstentions. Amendment not passed. The Decree on Power will be dealt with tomorrow, however. Yeltsin calls for a vote

on Bezrukov's amendment changing the word "functioning" to "existence". Vote: 53 for, 788 against, 35 abstentions. Not passed.

At 1440 GMT a deputy objects to the word "law-governed state". All states are law-governed. This is put to the vote: 340 for, 507 against, 43 abstentions.

At 1441 GMT Deputy Papkin proposes an extra sentence. Papkin explains the importance of this, as it affects the question of division of power. Put to vote: 434 for, 409 against, 62 abstentions. Not passed.

At this time the recorded relay ends, to be resumed at 1715 GMT.

Amendments Debated

LD1206183790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1715 GMT on 12 June continues its recorded relay of the 12 June proceedings of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow.

A vote is taken on a minor amendment which is rejected.

At 1720 GMT another amendment is submitted on the sovereignty of labor collectives and territorial units; it is rejected with 109 in favor and 744 against.

At 1721 GMT an amendment proposes adding the words "at the level of subjects of the federation." A deputy says that such amendments should be discussed at commissions and committees; too much time is being wasted. Yeltsin points out that many remarks have already been considered at the commissions and committees. These are fresh ones. The deputies are asked to vote on an amendment stipulating that a division of the functions of legislative and executive organs is a very important principle. It is rejected by 46 in favor and 831 against. The final wording of the clause is passed by 909 in favor, 21 against, with three abstentions.

An amendment on RSFSR recognition of international law and common human priorities does not gain an adeqaute number of votes in favor.

At 1730 GMT another amendment stipulating the RSFSR's support for international law and its aspiration to settle interethnic, interrepublican, and other conflicts by means of talks is rejected; with 92 in favor, and 791 against.

At 1732 GMT Tarasov, a military deputy, takes the microphone to speak about the RSFSR's obligation to defend its peoples and the interests of its peoples. An amendment to this effect is passed with 598 in favor, 237 against, and 40 abstentions.

At 1739 GMT Yeltsin reads out Article 14 in its amended form on the RSFSR's adherence to international law and commitment to settle conflicts between nationalities while, at the same time, defending the interests of the peoples of Russia.

At 1741 GMT a representative of the drafting commission takes the floor to explain the technical difficulties encountered in accommodating a large number of late amendments. He reads aloud the amended text of an article discussed yesterday. Yeltsin calls for the new wording to be distributed to all deputies and to be raised again later.

At 1750 GMT Yeltsin proposes that the congress should work on Saturday, Sunday, and Monday because the Congress of Russian Communists is to convene on Tuesday. One deputy suggests working Friday, Saturday, and Sunday but not Monday. Someone else says: Why shouldn't we have a day off? Another deputy asks why the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies should feel it has to make way for the Russian Communists' Congress. This idea is continued by someone else who says Sunday should be a rest day and then work should resume until the agenda is completed. Yeltsin points out that extremely important issues will be discussed at the USSR Supreme Soviet and this must not be ignored. Yeltsin's proposal is adopted with 765 in favor, 123 against, and 12 abstentions.

At 1759 GMT a vote is taken on a proposal that all references in the legislation to the RSFSR should be replaced by "the Russian Federation". It is rejected with 206 in favor, 704 against, and 23 abstentions.

At 1800 GMT proposals of candidacies to the constitutional commission are made. One deputy calls for secret voting on a multicandidate basis. Yeltsin says this is impractical: each territorical area has already held multicandidate elections for its own candidate. The proposal is rejected with 163 in favor, 691 against, and 24 abstentions.

Voting Begins

LD1206191690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1821 GMT on 12 June continues its recorded relay of the 12 June proceedings of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow.

Lukhov submits a proposal from the Omsk group of deputies. Yeltsin asks for a vote. Deputy Vedernikov speaks about Baburin. As a legal expert he should be kept on the list. Voting occurs on the candidature of Baburov and Katilenko. The vote goes for Baburov.

Deputy Batagov withdraws his candidature in favor of someone else. Yeltsin asks who is for Batagov's proposal. Vote: 498 in favor and 260 against. Deputy Ukhin speaks about forming lists of membership of the constitutional commission. A vote defeats the proposal.

At 1828 GMT Deputy Lutsov speaks for the Smena group, proposing a scientist for membership. The vote goes against the proposal. Yeltsin says a vote should be held on ending the issue there: 772 vote in favor and 54 against. No more candidates, says Yeltsin.

At 1840 GMT a deputy calls for election of chairman and deputy chairman of commission.

At 1841 GMT a 30-minute recess is announced.

The announcer says that the recorded relay of the congress will be resumed in one hour after sports coverage.

Constitutional Commission Viewed

LD1206223790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2100 GMT on 12 June resumes its recorded relay of the 12 June proceedings of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow. The delay in transmsision is due to soccer coverage.

Yeltsin opens the afternoon session by asking deputies to ensure that work is gone through more quickly.

At 2102 GMT a deputy complains that a previous speaker, Deputy Zadonskiy, had offended the congress by urging boycotts of votes and requests him to apologize. Zadonskiy himself comes to the microphone. He says he had spoken as a deputy, not as a member of the Secretariat; he says that there is such a thing as the right of the minority and this can be reflected in a decision to boycott a vote. The machinery of the majority frequently comes into action at the congress and sees its opinions implemented, he says. Yeltsin says passions should not be further heated; a commission on ethics will be created at some point to consider such matters. In the meantime, mutual respect is the key.

At 2107 GMT Yeltsin turns to the matter in hand—the formation of the constitutional commission. He suggests his own ideas for its formation; it should include a certain number of specialists who would set it up in good time. He calls for a vote on this. His proposal is not passed.

At 2110 GMT, a deputy speaks from the floor about whether the commission should be politicized or should consist of professionals. He suggests a third way, that it should consist of the widest possible spectrum of views so that it will be truly representative. Another deputy says the commission should reflect the territorial principle on which the congress is based.

At 2116 GMT a Buryatian deputy speaks about the list of specialist members of the commission proposed by Yeltsin. It will ensure that the commission is formed along its own lines and will therefore not be democratic.

At 2124 GMT a vote is taken on whether Yeltsin should chair the constitutional commission. The proposal is adopted and a list of specialist members is to be produced by Saturday.

At 2125 GMT discussion returns to the sovereignty debate. Deputies have now received the amendment to Article 9.

Deputy Ustinov calls for a careful attitude to this article, especially concerning the RSFSR's autonomy. Article 1, which defines the RSFSR's status within the USSR, would be torpedoed by the adoption of Article 9. He says Article 78 of the RSFSR's Constitution is sufficiently clear on the RSFSR's status.

Deputy Zhukov says he is in favor of the article but proposes further safeguards for autonomies.

Deputy Konstantinov from Leningrad says the congress is proposing to cast doubt over the centuries-long history of Russia with a stroke of the pen; there has not even been proper nationwide discussion of the issue. He calls for a referendum on Article 9.

Deputy Ostrenkov, from Kalinin Oblast, proposes an amendment providing for further expansion of the rights of autonomies.

Abdumadipov, from Dagestan, is concerned about the preservation of the rights of autonomies. He calls for a federal treaty for the RSFSR.

At 2200 GMT Yeltsin asks for a vote on whether to conclude the debate this point. This decision is adopted. Yeltsin speaks of the importance of the vote which is about to be taken on Article 9. He reads out the relevant article about a significant expansion in the rights of autonomies and of the RSFSR. A round of applause rings out. "I request you to vote on this edition of Article 9." He asks whether he should repeat the reading. It is not judged necessary. It is passed with 780 votes in favor, 98 against, and 25 abstentions.

A vote is now to be taken on the total declaration of the sovereignty of the RSFSR. There is a vote first on whether it should be a name vote; this is adopted with 861 in favor, 44 against, and two abstentions.

Finally, the total declaration is voted on. It is passed with 907 for in favor, 13 against, and nine abstentions. There is a standing ovation. Yeltsin says he congratulates all peoples of the Russian Federation.

Yeltsin remainds the deputies that the congress will convene on Saturday at 1000.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet remains to be elected, Yeltsin says. A vote is taken on whether the congress should proceed to this. The decision is adopted with 861 in favor, 15 against, and seven abstentions.

At 2212 GMT the recorded relay ends.

More on 12 June Congress Proceedings

LD1206113590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Igor Korotkov reports on today's Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] congress session.

[Begin recording] [Korotkov] This morning Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR, announced that since the session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR will begin in the Great Kremlin Hall tomorrow, the Congress of People's Deputies of Russia will break off its work until Saturday. On Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, and possibly later, depending on whether the agenda has been completed, the congress will work.

After that the people's deputies made various statements. Among others, the coordinator of the glasnost group, Aleksandr Tikhomirov, the political observer of Central Television, made the following statement:

[Tikhomirov] Rumors are going round that while we are in session here and the question of the mass media in the agenda of the 13th—and I have just learned that the time for the congress' work is being cut (?whether) we will manage to discuss this question—while we are in session here, according to our information the mass media of the RSFSR are being usurped. [sentence as heard]

On the 19th there will be an All-Russian [vse-rossiyskiy] party conference, and it is quite possible that the paper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA will be declared the paper of the Central Committee of the RSFSR Communist Party.

According to my information a document has already been signed in Gosteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting] to the effect that the structure of Gosteleradio is being changed, and will become such that there will be no money or possibilities for the RSFSR committee for television and radio broadcasting to be set up.

As for the paper, the party is part of the people—we have spoken about this already, that the Russian Communist Party is part of a part. For that reason I don't think the peoples of the RSFSR should be insulted from the very beginning, from the very first steps, by removing their only RSFSR paper.

The glasnost group proposes that a commission should be set up—or not set up, a deputies' commission has already been set up to work on the mass media—but to add several people to it for them to work in the commission, as a sub-commission, on clarifying relations on the subject of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, on the subject of Gosteleradio, in order to make a thorough preparation for this question, for the time when we start to discuss the question of the mass media on the agenda. And to add several persons to it: Tikhomirov, (Lysenko), (Chijkin), (Zhitkov), and (Kurkova). If the congress does not object, I would like to propose including these comrades, and entrusting us with work on coordinating these extremely important questions.

[Korotkov] The deputies confirmed the membership of the glasnost group and entrusted them with making a thorough investigation of the situation that has arisen and with reporting on the results to the Congress of People's Deputies.

Then Deputy (Krivoshapko) spoke on behalf of the Association of the Peoples of the North. He spoke of the miserable situation of the native population of the Far North, and proposed that the association should be officially registered and a commission of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation be set up on the affairs of the peoples of the north. This proposal was supported by the people's deputies. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Yeltsin Notes Significance of Declaration

LD1206211990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1955 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Remarks by RSFSR President Boris Yeltsin, place and date not given—recorded; presented by announcer Aleksandr Gurnov]

[Text] [Gurnov] The news about the adoption of the declaration on Russia's sovereignty is being broadcast throughout the world as a sensation. You have just been listening to the opinions of Muscovites. Perhaps they differ from yours, but I do not doubt that we will find it interesting to know another opinion, especially, as you will now hear, as Russian sovereignty also has to do with television.

[Yeltsin] An historic, absoluely unique document, the like of which there has not been perhaps in the whole history of our country; a decree, or rather a declaration on the sovereignty of Russia. It states there that everything that is within the boundaries of the whole of Russian territory is its own property. Television—it is its property, because the territory is the Russian Federation, and therefore, as we say, Russia will delegate a share of power to the center. So we are saying that Russian television will transmit a certain portion of this television to the center. But basically, this will be a Russian alternative television service, an independent one, perhaps even not a state one, but like an association—but anyway that is what you will be deciding there. [video shows Yeltsin speaking in open air, in close-up]

Deputy Chairman Views Sovereignty Declaration

LD1206212190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 12 June carries a five-minute report on a press conference given by Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, following the adoption of the RSFSR's adoption of the declaration on sovereignty.

He rejects press accusations that the work of the congress is proceeding slowly and that only half-hearted measures are being adopted. He stresses that differences of opinion at the congress are "only natural" and that agreement and understanding can be reached despite the opposing views.

In reply to a question by Igor Zorin on his view of the declaration on sovereignty, Khasbulatov says he considers it "a great success" and emphasizes the state significance of the declaration.

Khasbulatov says in conclusion that "within a year we must be able to show ourselves to be the real leaders of the new Russia and that we know how to lead Russia."

Deputy Travkin Comments on RSFSR Congress

18120125A Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 20, 27 May-03 Jun p 8

[Unattributed Article: "Divine Fate: Nikolai Travkin, people's deputy of the Russian Federation"]

[Text] No. If God had damned the people of Russia, he would have left them in a barren land, devoid of all riches. But god embarrassed us with riches. The land of Russia is so rich in forests, black earth, gold and other ores, that its people could only have prospered had they been industrious.

Why should we continue to live wretched lives when we could be living in clover? Where is the fault in the logic of our actions aimed at transforming the bountiful opportunities into a life of worthy human beings?

Remember the precondition ("had they been industrious")? Every person needs to believe that he or she is not handicapped mentally or physically. There can be no zeal in one's work without this belief.

A nation's ability to develop is linked to its belief in itself, in its potential, and strength. This creed is one of the conditions for survival.

At the dawn of the socialist era, the great leader once said in passing that Russians are no good as workers. The great leader may have had his reasons. Russia was lagging behind other nations. But whatever a leader says may be dangerous if it is believed unconditionally. Which is precisely what happened in this case. The next generation adopted, along with the ideology, its own inconsistency as workers. Even today one hears economist Leonid Abalkin attributing the failure of the reform to the fact that we are bad workers. The President says during his visit to the Urals: if you want to live ten times better, then you must work ten times harder. As simple as that. As if our living standards depend entirely upon how hard we chose to work. As if we made aircraft carriers costing 18 billion rubles a piece, reversed the flow of rivers, and waged a war in Afghanistan not at the expense of our own work. Is there any guarantee that once we start to work ten times harder, such expenditures would not be ten times greater, leaving us once again without anything?

The notion of our being bad workers is a convenient gimmick for our leaders. If a project goes through, then it is the credit of the "vanguard of society" which organized everything, but if it doesn't go through, then the people—the slack workers—are to blame.

We are going to lead wretched lives until we manage to shed our inferiority complex. We are already starting to cure ourselves, however slowly. We're already in the habit of hurling criticism at our leaders, including the topmost ones—we even overdo it. We are begining to do away with the veneration of dogmas, though still only in words, in slogans. The future of Russia depends upon whether the Congress—Russia's parliament—will be able to get the economy back onto the track of common sense, regulated by well-balanced legislation.

After all, we are not going to start all over from scratch. Behind us we have all the year-long work of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, with all their gains and losses. The gains must be extended to the work of Russia's Congress, and the losses must be made up for. Hafway measures and laws must be vetoed by Russia's representative power.

The Law on Land is ineffective not only because it doesn't allow one to buy land, to own it as a private property, but also because any potential buyer has no guarantee that he will not be dispossed, and his land taken away. The farmer must be given some assurance of the inviolatibility of his right to keep that land as private property. This assurance must be given to everyone who buys a plot of land. The same is true of the Law of Ownership. The enterprising worker will not believe us until we call each form of property by its proper name, including private property. This worker is not likely to start his business until then. But what are we going to do without the work of enterprising people? In other words, we musn't thoughtlessly copy these laws and rubberstamp them for use in Russian federation? On the contrary, we must meticulously analyze these laws and adapt them, to suit the RSFSR.

We musn't wait for the president or the USSR bodies of power to lead Russia out into the thoroughfare of progress. We ourselves must seek and find the way. Self-reliance is not granted it is earned, together with responsibility. We must free ourselves from the ideological "blinds" in such concepts as "exploitation", "denationalization", "integration into the world's economy", "the import of foreign capital", and "foreign concessions", because all of these terms are still "bad" as far as we're concerned. Either we continue to be conceited about being a superpower, or we begin to match the nations and our steps against the ability of these concepts to improve life, rather than against thier compliance with the socialist principle. After we awake from our lethargic slumber induced by the constraining communist ideology, we will see that we always had everything that we needed to make a prosperous life for ourselves: natural resources, enterprising people and bright minds. The ethnic groups that have lived in Russia since time immemorial can come to an understanding, without resorting to threats or blockades. But they can talk only among themselves, not through the mediation of top authorities. In order to make the top authorities less concerned with the problem of how to make the people happy, we must abandon the principle of forming the

USSR state budget from tax proceeds. Instead, we must introduce a system of payments for the fulfilment of specific projects. Then it will be easier to exercise control, and the temptation to intrude into matters of Russia's concern will disappear. Russia is capable of sorting out its economic relations with the rest of the world on its own. Likewise its relations with the Baltic republics, including the supply of gas—in rubles or in hard currency. The future of the currently shaky commonwealth of the USSR largely depends on Russia. Neighboring countries always sought to become part of a strong Russia, and every land wants to secede from a weak Russian state. But we can again become strong. We have every prerequisite for that. We can make a worthy life for each and every nation in Russia. To catch up with the rest of the world in technologies and electronics will require decades. But to supply food, clothes and other staple goods for our people, we don't need decades. That can be done within a couple of years. We only need common sense. I'm sure that the people's deputies of the Russian Federation have common sense.

USSR Deputy Advocates ASSR Autonomy

18120125B Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 20, 27 May - 03 Jun p 8

[Article by Nikolai Fyodorov, USSR people's deputy from the Chuvash ASSR: "Putting the Highest Stake on Freedom"]

[Text] Russia has long ceased to be Russian. Its face—the face of a rich state, politically and culturally diverse—has become obliterated. What remains is a prop for the blind, impersonal notion of "Centre"—giving and taking, pushing and pardoning. Even under the tsar, when the constitutional structure was different and the right of nations to self-determination was nonexisting, both the government and the numerous philanthropic organizations did much to preserve Russia's historical advantage and wealth—the immense diversity of its national cultures.

Today Russia amounts to a colossus of untapped intellectual, cultural and natural potential. This potential has not been tapped because any multiformity, has been totally suppressed for decades. The slogan proclaimed by the Revolution about the right of nations to self-determination turned out to be a fraud. The postulate on the merger of nations as they advance towards communism led us into a barracks.

According to the first Constitution of my native Chuvash Autonomous Republic, adopted in Soviet times on the basis of the 1922 Treaty of Alliance, Chuvashia is free to determine the "form of its relations with the federal authority (meaning the USSR) and the form of its participation in the federal government of the RFSFR." Further: "The legislative acts of the government of the Russian Federation, being of universal federal importance, shall be issued on preliminary agreement with the government of the Chuvash ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]." Those were effective legal norms. What remains of those possibilities, for real estate autonomy? Nothing. Everything has been taken away. The rebirth of the norms of the 1920s is now the greatest hope cherished by many of Russia's peoples.

Talk about the freedoms and rights of peoples has become the fashion. As have the demands of deputies from the autonomous republics to include autonomous entities alongside Union Republics in one law or another. It's impossible to get used to the rights of the peoples being infringed upon, nor can freedom become a fashion. No people can resign itself to national humiliation. How can any people not feel that its dignity has been affected if in Chuvasia, chemical enterprises of Union jurisdiction tower like bastions, while local authorities have no right to influence them, or even to measure the degree to which they are poisoning our land and air and how?...

We all need to remember that both Russia and the Union are federations of peoples who have united of their own free will. To forget this means to revive the idea of national-liberation movements. However reluctant we may be to admit this, such is the reality, and some peoples have already reminded us of this. For the time being we USSR people's deputies have clearly not done enough to cope with the octopus of Union ministries and government departments: the old command system. That system has no nationality—it has fettered everyone. But today it is within Russia's power to rid itself of this system. By assuming control over its own budget, the extraction of raw materials, and all economic activities on the land of its peoples the Russian Federation will overlap that system's blood circulation and thus stimulate the real reorganization.

But so that the all-Union octopus should not be replaced with smaller octopuses—on a republican scale—we need to rid ourselves of incompetent politics. I hope that in Russia's parliament there will be enough new and wise people who will give priority not to ideology (the justification for octopuses of every colour) but to common sense and world experience. So far neither science nor world practice have devised anything else which could be counterposed to this octopus except the development of a market economy and the separation of political powers.

I also hope that Russia's new authorities will reconsider their attitude towards the existing set-up in the USSR. This will promote the adoption of a new Treaty of Alliance, this time based on a different foundation—truly dovetailing the interests of all the subjects of the new federation or confederation. This will have to be decided by those who sign it.

We the peoples of Russia need our own treaty. I don't think that all of Russia's autonomous republics will immediately change their political status. But they must have the power to do this and as soon as possible. Especially since every people's rights to do this is envisaged by many international covenants already ratified by

the USSR. What remains to be done is to work out a detailed legal mechanism for the Republics and other autonomous entities to change political status or even secede from the USSR. Nor shall we forget the lessons in the development of intra-Union relations. The degree of a people's freedom, like the degree of a person's freedom, is determined by the possibility to choose. And every people's choice will ultimately depend on the form of its political existence which will prove to be the most favourable for its free development. Such is the "magic circle" of freedom. Free peoples alone can make up a free and strong federation.

Russian Democratic Party Leaders on Policies

PM1206150390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Jun 90 First Edition p 4

[Article by Captain Third Class V. Urban incorporating interviews with Oleg Rumyantsev, cochairman of the Social Democratic Party of the Russian Federation, and Nikolay Travkin, chairman of the Democratic Party of Russia, under the "Who's Who" rubric; place, date not given: "Social Democrats and Democrats"]

[Text] The amendment of Article 6 of the USSR Constitution has opened the way to a multiparty system in the country. Many previously informal organizations have already proclaimed themselves parties, while others are laying claim to that status.

Recently the editorial mailbag has included quite a few questions along these lines: What are the new parties' guidelines on defense and the army? As a rule, these problems feature quite extensively in their program documents. One cannot accept or agree with all the points they raise, but pluralism is pluralism. Especially since, following the ratification of the USSR Law on Public Associations (it was already adopted at first reading and submitted for nationwide discussion), the new parties will be able to gain a normal legal status.

Two of those parties seem to us to be the most influential.

First, the Social Democratic Party of the Russian Federation. It held its constituent congress in May. Oleg Rumyantsev, a 29-year old RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputy, is one of its cochairmen. He is a graduate of Moscow State University and works as a scientific staffer at the USSR Academy of Sciences Eastern Europe and International Research Institute.

[Urban] Oleg Germanovich, could you outline the party's main ideas on the problems of greatest interest to our readers, namely, military problems?

[Rumyantsev] We advocate demilitarization. The main area is the demilitarization of the social consciousness, the demilitarization of schools and education generally. That stems from our system of values. We believe that military spending should be reduced substantially. This is the general trend in the world and is supported by the social democratic movement. I believe that our country has room to use the material and human resources that would be released in this way. Incidentally, part of those resources should be used specifically to retrain military specialists discharged as a result of cutbacks in the army. I see an opportunity here for the creation of a managerial school, for example. Many former officers have sufficient ability and experience for training here...

[Urban] But will there still be an army, in your opinion? If so, what principle of manpower acquisition do social democrats favor?

[Rumyantsev] At the moment a two-tier one. A professional staff, in other words military servicemen under contract, and volunteers. That is the first point. And second, we propose that draftees perform military service in their native republics and regions. In our view, such an approach to manpower acquisition offers great advantages. Particularly with regard to morale.

[Urban] As far as I am aware, the social democratic movement throughout the world pays great attention to social guarantees for the military. What is your position?

[Rumyantsev] The same. For example, we support the idea of creating a special military trade union. We are working in close contact with the social protection union "Shchit."

[Urban] One last question, Oleg Germanovich. To enshrine this idea in law, or at least to bring it up for discussion, requires a powerful parliamentary faction. How much support do you have among deputies?

[Rumyantsev] We have a parliamentary group. I repeat, a group, not a faction. There were 15 deputies at the Russian congress. The number of our supporters is growing, but our aim is not to use any means to expand the group. The policy must be popular. Then it will be attractive. We belong to the "Democratic Russia" bloc, and we elaborated one of the drafts on Russian sovereignty.

Around 30 USSR people's deputies support the social democratic movement. [end Rumyantsev]

Now for the Democratic Party of Russia (DPR). Its constituent conference was held 26-27 May. Nikolay Travkin, a USSR and RSFSR people's deputy, was elected chairman. He is 44 years old. He came to prominence in the late seventies as the initiator of the "team contract." He has been awarded the title Hero of Socialist Labor. He graduated from a construction technical college and from a teacher training institute as an external student, and studied at the Moscow Higher Party School. He was a delegate to two CPSU congresses and to the 19th All-Union Party Conference. He left the CPSU quite recently. He is chairman of a subcommittee of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of the Work of Soviets of People's Deputies and of the Development of Management and Self-Management.

[Urban] To what social base does the party aspire?

[Travkin] The term social base is a simplified approach. The party does not have a class bias, it is designed to appeal to the broad strata of society. Our thoughts focus in particular on protection for the producer (by which I mean both the worker and the leader who manages production). People need a normal, peaceful life.... The market economy and private property are the means to reach that.

[Urban] Is your party ready to become the ruling party, Nikolay Ilich?

[Travkin] Were it not, it would not have been created. But victory by parliamentary means alone.

[Urban] What military policy do you plan to pursue?

[Travkin] It is too soon to answer that question. But even before the creation of the party I was a convinced supporter of a professional army. Similarly, I support the idea of a depoliticized army.

[Urban] What does that mean?

[Travkin] The main obstacle are political organs in their present form. But as for the party that a soldier supports—that is his affair. Anything else would be a restriction of freedom of conscience.

[Urban] The problem of social guarantees for military servicemen is an urgent one nowadays. What is the DPR's attitude to that?

[Travkin] Society will have a strong social policy, as people say now, everyone will be aware of it. Without such a policy military servicemen suffer, as they are doing now. That is my opinion.

Passport Requirement Extended for Goods Purchases

LD1306055990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Text] The Mossovet [Moscow City Soviet] executive committee has decided to extend the term during which passports have to be produced to buy goods in the capital. Subsequently, via rayon committee, or rayon executive committees more correctly, Muscovites will be issued with special visiting cards, just as in Leningrad. Information about this was published in the TRUD newspaper today.

Moscow Officials Describe Refugee Problem

LD0506203490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] A press conference on the problems of refugees took place at the Mossoviet [Moscow City Soviet] today. Members of the Commission on Refugees' Affairs attached to the Mossoviet Presidium, representatives of the Russian Refugees' Committee, and representatives of Baku city fathers took part in it.

Listen to what Aleksandr Iozifovich Melnikov, chairman of the Commission on Refugees' Affairs attached to the Mossoviet Presidium had to say:

[Begin Melnikov recording] The absence of the law on the status of refugees and of a government program of assistance to refugees puts them in a position of being outcasts in society, deprived of prospects.

Proceeding from the situation that has emerged and guided by the ideals of humanism, justice, and democracy, the commission on the problems of refugees attached to the Mossoviet Presidium sees as its main aims: first, to observe the basic human rights with regard to refugees in Moscow. In connection with the extremely unsatisfactory course of preparations of the law on the status of refugees in the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Mossoviet is planning to adopt provisions concerning their interim status. In this context, permanent settlement of refugees in the Moscow region is not envisaged; measures preventing their excessive concentration in the capital are being put forward. Second: To render practical assistance to refugees hand in hand with the city's executive services and refugees' public committees.

In our activities, we count on an objective and truthful coverage of the refugee problem by the mass media and we are ready to cooperate here. There exist several charity funds which help refugees; the Sakharov Order of Mercy, the Fedorov Fund, the Red Cross provide relief to refugees. State assistance also exists, but it is very limited—one-time relief payments of 100 rubles. As for attempts to have them evicted, to stop feeding them, and so forth: yes, indeed, following the appearance of the Council of Ministers' decision Number 329 of 7 April, which stated that the time limit for refugees' residence in and near Moscow was 15 May, numerous departments viewed it as a call for action, and as of 15 May they completely stopped financing the housing of refugees and food provision for them. Not all of them, however, and that is fortunate.

On this point, we turned to the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Republic] Council of Ministers, to the commission headed by Deputy Minister Gorshkov. Appeals to him were, naturally, made from other sources. Subsequently there was an instruction from the USSR Minister of Finances, a circular on the continuation of financing them. Currently, the Council of Ministers has set a time limit expiring 10 June, but Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, gave assurances to the effect that financing of refugees' residence will continue till their problem has been resolved. [end recording]

Unethical Conduct by Moscow Mayor Alleged

90UN1966D Moscow VETERAN in Russian No 22 28 May-3 Jun 90 p 5

[Article by V. Dobrov: "Strokes in the Portrait of Professor Popov"]

[Text] "Esteemed editorial board!

"As a veteran of labor and the Communist Party who follows events in our country with pain and alarm, I was extremely concerned about the articles on the civic, scientific, and moral-ethical profile of the well-known economist, USSR People's Deputy G.Kh. Popov, who was recently elected chairman of the Moscow City Soviet (SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 13 April 1990 and LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA, No. 15, 13 April 1990). If the facts outlined in the articles are true, then a real emergency has occurred—an unprincipled, unscrupulous man who is prepared to engage in what essentially are swindles and machinations punishable under the criminal law for personal gain, has ended up in the post of the mayor of our capital.

"On the other hand, if a lot of nonsense has been made up about an honest man (such things happen very frequently at present) somebody should be held severely accountable for that; after all, at issue is the reputation of an influential official.

"Unfortunately, at the first session of the Moscow Soviet these articles were not duly reviewed, discussed, and assessed. Perhaps, opportunistic and tactical considerations were a factor. After all, G.Kh. Popov is the leader of the "Democratic Russia" bloc which has won a majority in elections to the Moscow Soviet, and many people on it are, putting it mildly, not interested in ascertaining the truth. I am convinced that it would be fundamentally incorrect to 'hush up' this issue because it is of great significance in principle not only for Muscovites but also for the entire country.

"I have been following articles in your weekly attentively, and I know that you approach the complex and tangled problems of our reality objectively and fairly. I believe it would be extremely useful and even necessary for the readers to have your employee investigate this issue additionally.
[Signed] Respectfully, Leongard Seliverstovich Kushch.
"P.S. I have sent a copy of this letter to the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission for Ethics."

At the request of the editorial office, V. Dobrov who has met and talked with the people who know G.Kh. Popov well and has familiarized himself with materials and documents reflecting his activities, comments on the letter.

As is known, speaking at a Moscow Soviet session, G.Kh. Popov himself virtually shrugged off the charges leveled at him: Supposedly, it is not worthwhile to take them seriously; after all, you cannot sue the slanderers. The question is: Why not, if what is at issue is the reputation, honor, and dignity of a USSR people's deputy, a prominent scientist and essayist, all the more so because serious and widely read publications have carried exposes. No matter how hard the burden of concerns which swamped the new mayor of the capital city is, time could always be found to refute evident falsehoods. It would suffice to unmask the slanderers in the mass media which reproduce the pronouncements of Gavriil Kharitonovich instantly and in the greatest press runs. You would agree that this kind of passiveness is strange for an individual of whom almost impossible activity has been characteristic heretofore....

Having familiarized myself attentively with the scientific and political career of G. Popov, I came to the conclusion that the "figure of omission" is most likely explained by his desire to "hush up" faster the unattractive circumstances fraught with the most unpleasant consequences. Judge for yourselves.

It was reported in the aforementioned articles that, on the eve of discussing candidates for nomination to the USSR Academy of Sciences, G. Popov sent the academicians who were resolving this issue baskets with cognac and champagne. A call followed to Academician A.M. Rumyantsev, who was present at the discussion. He confirmed this fact and added that G. Popov attempted to ensure the academic title in the only vacant field, "Economics of the Construction Industry," without having major scientific works on this topic. This circumstance prevented many prominent economists from nominating themselves. Gavriil Kharitonovich paid no attention to such "trifles."

In the newspaper MOSKOVSKIY UNIVERSITET dated 25 May 1988 I found a statement by an instructor from the Moscow State University Department of Mathematics and Mechanics in which he, rejecting the candidacy of Popov as a delegate to the 19th Party Conference, said that a man who allowed himself to use the powers and authority of the dean in order to influence the results of admission exams is not a worthy representative of the university due to his moral traits. In the materials of the Leninskiy Rayon Procuracy and the Krasnopresnenskiy Rayon Department of Internal Affairs of the capital, I encountered the name of G. Popov as the individual who failed to ensure due control and order in the Moscow State University Center for the Management of Public Production, which he headed. Machinations which attracted the attention of the investigative organs went on at the center, in which individuals close to G. Popov vigorously participated. He personally, was directly involved with these machinations. The fact that the closest associates of Gavriil Kharitonovich—Shchennikov, Dzhangirov, Gorbatyy, and Repko—were investigated and criminal charges were filed, which was mentioned in the press, is also correct. The name of G. Popov was mentioned repeatedly in articles in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA (28 October 1979, 27 April 1980) and MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA (28 November 1987 and 5 July 1987), which were much talked of at the time, about the improper actions of a certain Yu. Petrov who had his doctoral degree revoked for obvious and shameless plagiarism. Gavriil Kharitonovich, as the newspapers reported, was the "godfather" of the phony dissertation and shielded Petrov in every way possible...

It is also true that the second home of G. Popov, in the settlement of Vnukovo near Moscow, which was rebuilt into a luxurious villa over time, is estimated to have cost a lot of money. This is to say nothing about the compound which is "non-standard" in size and various structures. I visited the second-home settlement myself, and initially even confused the summer residence of the professor with the country facility of a day-care center.

Now, about what has not been published and what causes additional, even more alarming questions.

While familiarizing myself with the multifaceted activities of G. Popov in the position of head of the Moscow State University Center for the Management of Public Production, I noted the extremely high, much higher than "average," share of cases with a lethal or unseemly outcome in the immediate entourage of the professor. However, judge for yourselves:

Ye.K. Nagibin, employee of the center who carried out G. Popov's assignments (died in August 1970, at the age of 38); V.M. Fedorov, leading engineer of the laboratory for economic contracts (committed suicide in August 1971); Ye.M. Lapkin, employee of the laboratory (died in 1971, was run over by a car); V.N. Chirikov who was in close contact with G. Popov in conjunction with an economic contract with the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Gosplan [State Planning Committee] TsNIIS [Central Scientific Research Institute of Construction] (ended up in prison in 1975); I.V. Polyakov, an Moscow State University employee who cooperated with Popov (died in 1975); V. Nefedov who was in touch with the immediate entourage of G. Popov and with him personally (ended up in prison in 1975); V.A. Korobov, an employee of the center (died in 1980 at the age of 42); V. Zakharin, G. Popov's graduate student (died in a car accident in 1981); Yu.N. Bronnikov, associate professor of Popov's chair (suddenly died in 1987 at the age of 47); R.R. Papayan, employee of the chair who was summoned to testify together with G. Popov in one of the criminal cases (died in July 1989). We should add to this that in the late 1980's Chief of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Academy Lieutenant General Krylov, with whom G. Popov cooperated, committed suicide. Krylov was being investigated on charges of embezzling from the state on a particularly large scale.

In all honesty, when I verified the veracity of these facts, the following question immediately arose: What were the investigative organs doing, why did they not pay attention to the suspect frequency of various types of emergencies, including lethal cases? However, I immediately recalled that, as is known, the aforementioned Lieutenant General Krylov had direct access to former Minister of Internal Affairs Shchelokov and his infamous deputy Churbanov.

We must say that G. Popov always had, and still has, more than enough influential benefactors, and in quite high spheres at that. When the Committee of Party Control of the CPSU Central Committee took an interest in his machinations, Gavriil Kharitonovich, cushioning the unavoidable blow, "voluntarily" left the post of dean of the Moscow State University Department of Economics, ultimately getting off with a party reprimand, and even that for the relatively innocuous failure to pay party dues on his honoraria. The word was that the intercession of V.V. Grishin, former first secretary of the CPSU Moscow City Committee, whose portrait was prominently displayed in Popov's office, helped the well-known economist come out unscathed. I have carefully verified information on the strong inclination of the professor to recruit for scientific leadership the sons and daughters of the people who were members of the party-state elite, and I can confirm: His proteges included not only V.V. Grishin's daughter-in-law, but also the grandson of N.S. Khrushchev, sons of the chairmen of the Councils of Ministers of the Lithuanian and Armenian SSRs [Soviet Socialist Republic], and offsprings of the ministers, academicians, ranking functionaries of the CPSU Central Committee, the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], and especially the leaders of the central publications and publishing houses. The method of drawing into joint scientific work influential people, such as, for example, former Academician D.M. Gvishiani, A.N. Kosygin's son-in-law, B.I. Gostev, department head of the CPSU Central Committee and former minister of finance, and others of lower ranks, was quite vigorously used...

However, we have to discuss this not only in the past tense. Old connections and "trapping" the necessary people in a net of pleasant favors helps G. Popov a lot at present as well. Despite the rejection of his candidacy to the 19th Party Conference by the Moscow State University Party Committee and the expression of no confidence in the nomination process of people's deputies from the Moscow State University and the USSR Academy of Sciences, he nonetheless managed to get to the parliament from the Union of Scientific and Engineering Societies in which "his" people turned a blind eye to the protests of Moscow State University scientific associates who knew him. Let us recall in this reference that the daughters of Academicians A. Aganbegyan and S. Shatalin and the son of V.A. Vedernikov, former deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, are among G. Popov's former graduate students. I am not going to say anything about the official and scientific contacts of G.I. Popov—after all, there are big names among them...

I am far from casting aspersions on the quite meritorious and respected people mentioned above; after all, scientific contacts largely develop unpredictably and randomly—that is, as far as they are concerned. However, this is hardly so as far as Gavriil Kharitonovich is concerned. Some academicians are not able to establish as many useful connections with "the powers that be" in their lifetimes as G. Popov does in a short two or three years. It is more appropriate to refer to an active, purposeful, and quite crafty tactic in this case. It will

immediately become understandable why the outstanding economist who has become a major political figure climbs in through the window with such ease when the door is slammed in his face, and manages to steal himself in through the transom when they shut the window on him. In short, I support the proposal made in the press to check out comprehensively the financial standing and the moral and ethical qualities of the new chairman of the Moscow Soviet.

In summation, one more observation. While preparing this article, I talked to many people, mainly scientific associates and instructors of the Moscow State University at which Professor Popov is very well known. They said many sharp words about him, but not a single one, I stress—not a single one of them agreed to have his name mentioned.

A well-known professor and doctor of economic sciences who also wanted to remain anonymous told me: "Popov knows how to take revenge. He deals with the people in a modern manner, drawing on the opinion of 'a healthy collective' which is bound by mutual guarantees and trained in false protests and 'testimony' against 'the transgressor' who sets himself against the people. You would say that I am afraid. Indeed, I am! In the war with the Germans, I was the first one to rise for an attack and risk my life. In this instance, my relatives and loved ones who may suffer are at issue. Having become chairman of the Moscow Soviet, Popov has secured unlimited possibilities for settling scores with all those who are going to get in his way, and he is going to take advantage of them, as they say, to the maximum. I know him all too well. When those like Popov climb up fear begins to grip honest people, more powerful than that the Italians' fear of the mafia. There is nothing we can do: Look how easily the deputies of the Moscow Soviet 'believed' a couple of phrases about slander which G. Popov uttered in passing, despite the seriousness of the charges leveled at him being beyond a doubt for many people. Apparently, we are meant to live through the nightmare which was graphically shown in the TV serial on the commissar of Catania."

Could my interlocutor really be right?

EDITORIAL NOTE: Such suppositions can frighten anyone. The editorial board is reassured only by the willingness of the author to defend the veracity of the facts and documents he referred to in open court proceedings.

Prokofyev Addresses Moscow City Party Plenum

90UN2004C Moscow VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA in Russian 31 May 90 p 2

[Speech by Yu.A. Prokofyev, first secretary of the CPSU Moscow City Committee, at 30 May CPSU Moscow City Committee Plenum]

[Text] Comrades!

Every passing day brings us closer to an exceptionally important landmark in the history of our party, the 28th CPSU Congress.

Will the party be able to attain a qualitatively new level of its development?

Will it be up to radical changes in policy and in its own structure, which are so necessary and are awaited by a majority of communists?

Will the CPSU work out a viable program, which meets the demands of the people, for taking the country out of the crisis?

Life itself and the people's essentially depleted credit of confidence in the party compel us to ponder these and similar questions. The party will be able to secure new credit from the people if it finally transforms itself along democratic lines rather than talking endlessly about being prepared to do so while preserving the status quo of the old command-administrative system which originated with the party hierarchies.

At issue is the political future of the party in a manner as serious as never before. It is being decided right now, during these days, on the eve of the congress, and it will be decided at the congress itself.

Judging by the beginning of the precongress discussions and passions, in the literal meaning of this word, the party, as well as our society at large, are looking at making a difficult choice between an attempt to conserve the party, which holds no promise at all, and the pressing need to radicalize the emerging democratic transformations inside the party itself, in its thinking, and in its mutual relations with a changing society.

The political situation is developing so rapidly that, perhaps, at present it is no longer possible to remain in between these antagonistic trends. We may not only fall behind the development of events, but the danger is also quite real of calling the future of the party into doubt through attempts to reconcile the irreconcilable.

I am convinced that the congress will opt for democratizing the party.

In the course of precongress discussions many doubts were voiced regarding the possibility of such transformations in the party on the basis of the CPSU Central Committee platform. I will say straightforwardly that I do not fully share these doubts, though I treat the essence of this most important document quite critically; I have expressed my point of view regarding this at the Central Committee plenum, and it is widely known. This document submitted for a discussion by the entire party was and is open for businesslike criticism, for constructive work on it.

I would say that the Central Committee platform is also receptive to the so-called alternative platforms that have come up—these are the Democratic platform, the

Marxist platform, the Political position of the Moscow Conference of Secretaries of Primary Party Organizations, and others.

Incidentally, I will say that the very presence of various opinions in the party, the freedom of political thinking in our society, and the real opportunity to make free ideological and moral choices which the Soviet people have acquired are good, and they are a considerable result of the political transformations carried out in the country. The right to have such a choice should come to the people as naturally as breathing, walking, and enjoying life freely.

However, the right of the people adhering to a particular ideology to fight for their convictions should also be normal. The real situation at present is developing in such a manner that the struggle against the CPSU is being openly waged at both intellectual-journalistic and primitive-mundane levels. This is why, while welcoming these changes in society, we as a political party, the party of communists, cannot fail to respond to the mounting wave of anticommunism.

The anticommunist pressure does affect the party. We cannot fail to notice the confusion of many communists, the abandonment of political struggle, the turning inward, and defeatist sentiments.

The above factors have definitely affected the party discussion. Its course shows considerable dissatisfaction with the precongress documents prepared by the Central Committee. Nihilistic attitudes in the party and the lack of trust in everything originating from the Central Committee are factors, and considerable ones at that.

It is quite understandable that under the circumstances it becomes necessary for every communist, every party organization, to clearly determine their views on the future of the party and openly state them so as to make it possible for the congress to work out a unified political line, taking into account the existing multitude of voices. Without coming to an internal consensus the party will hardly be capable of a dialogue with other political forces emerging in our society.

Proceeding from the above, the Moscow City Party Organization should also make its political position known before the congress. At the request of the last plenum of the gorkom [city party committee] the draft of such a document has been drawn up, and it is being vigorously discussed at present. It was reviewed by the bureaus, CPSU MGK [Moscow City Committee] commissions, party raykoms [rayon committees], and was approved by a number of primary party organizations. Participants in the present plenum have received the text of this draft. The wording of the draft submitted for your consideration takes into account the views stated by the permanent Conference of Secretaries of Primary Party Organizations. The draft was reworked substantially taking into account what was said at meetings in the club of congress delegates and at the city conference.

It is suggested that the draft position be published in the press after its discussion at the plenum, and that the document be finally adopted at the 28th City Party Conference.

In the opinion of the gorkom bureau, the forthcoming conference should focus its attention on a profound analysis of the contemporary socioeconomic policy of the party, on determining the role of the city CPSU organization in the environment of economic transformations and political reforms, of a multiparty system emerging in the country. The decisions of the conference should determine the steps of the city party conference dictated by the situation, which are closely interrelated with the strategic goals and directions of operation of the entire party.

An all-Moscow party discussion, inaugurated on the initiative of a number of large party organizations of the city and supported by the gorkom, became the key element of precongress activities. For the first time in many years the preparation of most crucial political decisions proceeded "from the bottom up" rather than the other way around, as was usually the case. A considerable number of communists took part in it. A variety of assessments, opinions, and views regarding the past, the present, and the future of the party came to the fore; various approaches to reforming it were proposed. At the first stage of the discussion the process of the free formation of political positions of party organs and action associations of the communists proceeded, whereas at the second stage the discussion embarked on the difficult stage of comparing these positions and platforms, looking for a consensus view, and developing common approaches, which is, of course, extremely complicated given the current political situation. The city party conference will sum up the precongress discussion in Moscow by adopting, as is expected, "The Position of the Moscow City CPSU Organization for the 28th Party Congress."

We should say that various points of view exist regarding the document prepared and handed out to you. For the most part the text of "The Position of the Moscow City Party Organization for the 28th CPSU Congress" is evaluated as quite an acceptable document, though in need of serious additional work. This will be done taking into account your views and discussions in the deputies club. Many CPSU raykoms have used the draft in order to prepare their own rayon positions and platforms. Some raykoms believe that the document should be different in both form and content.

I think that it is hardly justified to "polish" it endlessly and "perfect" specific details at the expense of determining truly important fundamental positions. In conjunction with this, I would like to state several considerations which are important in principle.

First. We proceeded from the fact that the Position of the City Party Organization should come up with answers to the most acute questions of principle. It was hardly

expedient to develop an extensive platform. Even without this, more than 20 different platforms are being discussed, adopted, and so on in the party organizations of the country. We considered it more important to ensure that the Position of the Moscow City Party Organization incorporates everything valuable that the discussion has given us and all the rational thoughts found in both the Central Committee Platform and in other platforms that have appeared.

Second. The development of such a document was also necessary because the unsatisfactory level of theoretical activities of the CPSU is clearly felt. Scientific study of many of the most complex issues of the development of our society is at an embryonic stage. Dogmatism and inertia are still alive; many of the old postulates have been toppled by life itself. There is no time to wait for party science, for the social scientists to respond to all questions, and in such a manner that everyone agrees with them. We live in a specific time, in a specific country, and in a specific situation. We should make specific political decisions, and do so urgently, because the common opinion is that the rate of decline of the influence of the party is considerably higher than the rate of its perestroyka. The contradiction that exists needs to be overcome.

We have an opportunity to do this on the basis of a principled agreement on the main problems. We have no right to let this opportunity slip.

Third. The idea of consolidation on a principled basis is vital for the party and society; it is increasingly held by communists, all the more so because the discussion of the platforms developed in the party has shown that differences frequently focus on partial issues. Whether deliberately or not, the authors and participants in the discussions have frequently made them a priority, thus inflaming passions. This condition in the party needs to be overcome. This may only be accomplished by searching for a consensus. The platforms which have become widely known provide a realistic foundation for it—all of them contain many provisions useful for democratizing the party.

It is clear that in the environment of a real multiparty system not only we, those present in the hall today, or those who have been elected delegates to the city conference, will make a choice. At present this problem confronts every party member and our entire society in all of its enormity. Under the circumstances, it would be a fatal mistake to hope that the authority of the decisions of the city conference or the congress will do the job automatically. This belief in the magical power of party documents, "communist self-conceit," as V.I. Lenin called it, has already cost and continues to cost the party too much.

This is why we proceed from the fact that the position should exhibit a high degree of generalization of fundamental problems, unambiguous assessments, and be concise and convincing, so that every communist can understand the essence of transformations under way in our society and the party and accept this document as the foundation of a program of his own activities.

With regard to the content we may point out several problems which have caused the liveliest discussion.

The first one of them is our transition to a market. We proceed from the idea that the market is not a capitalist notion. It is inherent in all sociopolitical formations. At issue is bringing the economy to the standards of operation in keeping with the objective laws of its development.

It is another matter that under these new conditions the policy of the party should be to defend socialist accomplishments and ensure the social protection of the workers against unavoidable negative phenomena such as the growth of prices, unemployment, and inflation.

There is no doubt that the transition to the market economy will be very hard, especially on the working people. Steps aimed at implementing it should be that much more prudent. The people need to be consulted extensively. Incidentally, this was promised but has fizzled along with many other promises.

Proposals by the government were not discussed in the party either. In essence the party was removed from developing a policy of transition to the market. Meanwhile the CPSU, which remains the ruling party, should be discussing such radical measures at least at an expanded plenum of the Central Committee, if not at the congress. After all, all steps by the government and leadership of the country are at present associated with the party one way or another.

In conjunction with this I believe that today at the plenum we should state our point of view very definitively—adopting a decision that unavoidably brings about a drop in the living standard of an overwhelming majority of our society is only possible in the case of a civil agreement and approval by the people.

To this end an all-people's referendum needs to be held. If a report at a USSR Supreme Soviet session alone caused confusion and panic in our society when the shelves were swept clean of literally everything, what can we expect after price increases if they are introduced without the consent of people!

One more point. I am convinced that this should be the object of a discussion at the 28th Congress.

The social base of the party is **the second issue.** The CPSU cannot remain a party of the entire people, nor can it express the interests of those who come out against the socialist option of the country, preach national exclusivity and racial enmity, or exploit the labor of others. All of these constitute the social bases of parties which are different in principle.

Broad strata of our society, including workers, rural workers, the intelligentsia, and clerical workers who have

one way or another dedicated their lives to socialism constitute the potential base of our renewed party. The main political task of the communists as of now is to firmly defend the interests and legitimate rights of hired blue-collar and white-collar employees, low-income and socially unprotected groups of the populace, and servicemen. It is exactly these social strata that associate their future with ensuring actual social justice rather than with the extensive development of private enterprise.

The nature of the party and the content of its activities under new conditions and its organizational structure are **the third problem.** Coming out against reducing the activities of the party exclusively to parliamentary practices, we believe that it is necessary to substantially revise its tasks, especially under a multiparty system.

It is necessary to form effective structures and realign the content of political activities, to go literally into the streets, squares, and residential blocks. After all, political struggle for representation in the organ of power, for the votes of the electorate, is becoming one of the main functions of the party.

Work in the organs of people's power will have to be structured in a new manner, with a view to achieving our goals through our deputies; the policy of blocs will have to be mastered—it is already a reality.

Work in the labor collectives should be structured differently, taking into account new conditions, in which monitoring the actions of the management is becoming a thing of the past. In a word, the skill of conducting ideological work with the masses is turning from a declaration into a pressing need.

Real participation by communists in making decisions is the main point for the future of the party. As we see it, we should practice party referendums, study public opinion, and mainly proceed from them. The principle of holding direct, secret, competitive elections of the leading organs, and their regular reporting to the communists, needs to be codified in the party. The party should be safeguarded against a recurrence of the past, manifestations of "communist self-conceit," and the cult of personality.

The spending of party funds needs to be rigidly controlled. The budgets of party committees need to be confirmed by elected organs, and their implementation should be public.

Concerning the principle of democratic centralism, we should acknowledge that many communists do not accept the term itself. In the party organizations they associate it with the practice of rigidly centralized power in the party which emerged in the past, the complete subjugation of the entire life of the party to the will of its leadership, and the merely formal declaration of democratic principles which, in essence, were lifeless.

This is why it is becoming necessary to put forth another principle of democratic organization and management of the party which will meet the requirements of our time. No political organism can do without it: Strict discipline is needed for its operation. Even the present-day "liberals" subscribe to stringent centralism while cursing it at the rallies. However, democratism should, of course, be emphasized more—this includes the protection of the rights of a minority, the operation of horizontal structures, party clubs, and platform-based associations.

The issue of creating the Russian Communist Party has arisen sharply in the context of separatist attitudes in the republic party organizations. A majority are coming out "in favor." However, the danger of dragging the CPSU apart into national compartments is too high.

We are in favor of holding a conference on 19 June of this year with the participation of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress from oblast, okrug, and kray party organizations of Russia. The fate of the Russian Communist Party should be decided there. The situation is developing in such a manner that, perhaps, we should unambiguously refer to the need to create the Russian Communist Party.

At present sharp discussions about the future of our society are under way. The greatest difficulties are occurring due to the absence of a conceptual development of the model of its future.

Designing new dogmas and making practice fit them is not the object. However, it is necessary to see the outline of a society we want to arrive at. The people need this in order to be able to make a conscious choice between particular political programs.

Along with the discussion of the draft political platform, another precongress document is being discussed—the draft CPSU Statute. It is more specific; this draft is more understandable for the bulk of the communists. Naturally, more proposals and remarks have been made regarding it (more than 5,000), which are being generalized and analyzed. A working group has prepared a summary of proposals concerning the draft statute which are submitted for your consideration.

By way of a summary, we may say that these remarks and additions reinforce the following directions of perestroyka in the party:

—democratization of intraparty relations as the basis for renewing the CPSU;

—new approaches to forming the ranks of the CPSU with regard to both admissions to the party and leaving it;

—endowing the organizational structure of the CPSU with a new content. The provision that primary organizations are the party itself should be actually implemented;

—the affirmation of collective forms of operation of party committees, complete subordination of the apparatus to the elected organ, determination of its strength and structure on the basis of the target-specific tasks of political, ideological, and organizational work, conducting sociological and political-science studies and other activities;

—new approaches to the interaction of the CPSU and the state and economic organs, and other sociopolitical organizations and movements in the environment of asserting a genuine multiparty system;

—restructuring control, audit, and financial-economic operations of the party, public and democratic formation and disbursement of the party budget, and a number of other issues.

Delegates to the city party conference have become directly involved in the course of preparations for the conference. The city club of conference and congress delegates is in operation. Virtually one-half of the delegates to the conference have become vigorously involved in developing its documents.

Several days ago an appeal was published by participants in the club to the CPSU Central Committee, the CPSU Politburo, delegates of the 28th CPSU Congress, and communists of the country for creating the All-Union Club, the goal of which would be to consolidate the corps of deputies in the process of joint work with the Central Committee commissions by developing a common political position and to work out acceptable draft congress documents.

In the city club work is proceeding along the following major avenues: preparation of the draft "Position of the City Party Organization," summarized proposals for the draft statute, as well as draft texts of the resolutions of the city conference "On Working in the Soviets" and "On the Young People." Besides this, the following commissions are in operation: for forming the working organs of the conference, its procedures, and preparation of proposals concerning candidates to the central organs of the party.

The draft documents under review today take into account the work done, but are not final.

Briefly about another important element of precongress work—delegate elections. As you know, on the initiative of the city party organizations and in keeping with the decision of the March Central Committee Plenum, elections of delegates to the congress and the city conference were held on the basis of a direct, secret, and competitive vote in party electoral districts; in the process, the right to ultimately resolve the issue of delegate elections was given to rayon party organizations.

By now, 274 out of 279 delegates to the congress and 1,190 out of 1,198 delegates to the city conference have been elected after two rounds of voting, and in elections to vacant seats at rayon party conferences.

There are a considerable number of party committee and party bureau, rayon, and city CPSU committee secretaries, economic managers of various levels, representatives of the intelligentsia, clerical employees, and specialists among the elected delegates.

M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and members of the Central Committee Politburo N.I. Ryzhkov, E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, V.A. Kryuchkov, and Yu.D. Maslyukov became delegates to the congress from Moscow.

We should note with regret that workers, women, and young people are underrepresented in the corps of delegates.

Comrade V.B. Nosov, chairman of the city electoral commission, will report today in more detail about the results of the election of delegates to the congress and the city party conference. Perhaps anticipating things a little, I would only like to note that a powerful, hard-working, and creative delegate corps has been formed which has considerable intellectual potential and represents various views and positions which are present in the party. These are our comrades who have honorably passed the trial of honest, multicandidate contests and are rightfully the authorized representatives of the communists of Moscow, enjoying their confidence and support.

Report-and-election meetings and conferences were held in a number of party organizations of the city simultaneously with delegate elections. In keeping with the decisions of the March CPSU Central Committee plenum and a plenum of the party gorkom, the right to schedule reports and elections was given to the primary organizations themselves. As a result, report-and-election meetings and conferences will be held in nine percent of the primary organizations of the city and one rayon (Kuntsevskiy Rayon) organization before the 28th CPSU Congress.

The atmosphere at the meetings and conferences is determined by the critical attitude of their participants to superior party organs, including the CPSU Central Committee. The democratic nature of elections of the leading organs and secretaries of the party organizations is noteworthy. Sixty-nine percent of them were elected directly at the meetings, and one in two was elected on a competitive basis. The turnover of secretaries is high (68 percent), and in the process one secretary in five withdrew his candidacy. Rayon party conferences were marked by the striving of their communist-delegates for consolidation, regardless of the political platforms to which they subscribe.

Several specific remarks about the manner in which the 28th City Party Conference is expected to be held. At its last plenum, the CPSU MGK adopted a draft conference agenda which includes the discussion of precongress documents, the draft "Position of the City Party Organization" and proposals on the statute, as well as the consideration of proposals on candidates to the central party organs.

Today we expanded the agenda of the conference somewhat, including a report on the results of electing delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress.

At the conference it is expected that a report will be heard first which contains an evaluation of the current situation, sums up the results of a discussion in the city party organization, and comments on the draft position and amendments in the statute prepared. After these issues are discussed, it is expected that "The Position of the City Party Organization" and generalized proposals on the CPSU Statute are going to be adopted.

Proposals have already been made, and discussed by the CPSU MGK bureau, to adopt special resolutions on work in the soviets, on the party and the young people, and on creating the Russian Communist Party. We would like to know your opinion about this.

Later in the conference a report by the chairman of the city election commission on the results of electing delegates to the 28th Congress is planned.

During a discussion at the gorkom bureau a proposal was made for the delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress who are not delegates to the city conference to take part directly in its work. This proposal appears expedient to us.

Finally, the issue of possible candidacies to the central party organs will be resolved on the basis of proposals by rayon and primary party organizations summarized by a working group of delegates.

At the conference we should also make a decision on the important issue of holding its second stage, the main task of which is to set forth the tasks of the city party organization in light of the decisions of the 28th CPSU Congress, form a new composition of the leading organs of the city party organization, resolve the issue of the structure of the gorkom and its apparatus, and consider other issues.

It appears expedient—incidentally, this is what most rayon party conferences have done—to extend the authority of delegates to the city conferences until the second stage so that they can use this period for consulting with the communists and primary party organizations, and developing proposals on all these issues.

The second stage of the conference will be held in the fall. It is hard to determine a more precise time at present. We will make this decision after the 28th CPSU Congress.

These are, in brief, my considerations regarding the draft "Position of the City Party Organization for the 28th Party Congress," additions and changes to the statute, and proposals on procedures for holding the state party conference. I invite participants in the plenum to discuss these issues.

Government Sends Condolences to Miners' Families

LD1206165990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] At the Donbass mine [as heard; Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 2330 GMT on 12 June carries a shorter version of this report, clarifying the mine is actually in the Kuzbass] named after Dimitrov, where an inrush of water occurred on 9 June, the main consequences of the accident have been eliminated. Mine rescue workers, divers, and miners carried out a great deal of work to clear the scene of the accident and to search for the victims.

It is deeply regretted that none of the 11 people remained alive. The USSR Council of Minister has expressed condolences to the families and friends of those who died. A state commission and the local bodies are lending assistance to the families of those who have lost breadwinners. In the next few days the mine will begin working normally again.

Could the misfortune have been avoided? A TASS corespondent put that question to Shchadov, minister of coal industry of the USSR. In this case, the workers in the flooding zone did not violate the safety regulations, he said. But the accident took place and the conditions for it were created by people, leaders, from the shfit foreman to the mine's chief engineer. The geological and mine-surveying service did not work with all due efficiency. If they feared that even the least amount of water might be in the line end of the next level up then they should have extracted that water, drawn the attention of other subdivisions to it. Then, the engineering and technical workers would have made provision for the appropriate safety measures.

A state commission has revealed the circumstances and the causes of the accident. Experts replied to questions from a scientific and practical point of view. The conclusions of the specialists were discussed at the All-Kuzbass Conference of Miners.

Hurricane Hits North Ossetiya; Damage Reported

LD1206202790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] A TASS correspondent has reported from Ordzhonikidze that a hurricane with hail, of unprecedented force has hit a number of rayons in the North Ossetiyan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR]. Areas of land sown to agricultural crops and orchards have been destroyed by the squally wind, strong hail, and heavy rain; bridges, roads, power lines, and communications have been put out of use. Water supplies to many populated areas have been disrupted. Hospitals, schools, children's preschool establishments, and thousands of residential buildings have been destroyed. There are no casualties among the population but dozens of rural inhabitants have been injured.

The hurricane-force wind felled trees and tore roofs off buildings. Then came the hail, the size of which exceeded a hen's egg. The epicenter of the strike by the elements were Alagirskiy, Digorskiy, and Rafskiy Rayons where serious material loss has been inflicted on dozens of settlements. A republican commission has been set up to overcome the consequences of the raging of the elements.

According to preliminary data, more than 20,000 hectares of land sown to winter crops, corn, and potatoes, have been destroyed; livestock farms and repair workshops have been damaged. The material loss inflicted has come to about R35 million.

Life in the rayons that have suffered is gradually returning to normal. Construction teams and collectives of industrial enterprises are restoring housing, bridges, power transmission lines, and communciations lines. Rayon headquarters are working round the clock. Aid is being given to people who have suffered.

Volgograd Party-Soviet Relations Examined

90UN1966C Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
27 May 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Article by V. Kornev: "He Refused to Join the Bureau"]

[Text] Volgograd—At the last plenum of the Volgograd Obkom [oblast party committee], the issue of interaction between the party and soviet organs was discussed. Also, a proposal was made there to co-opt into the obkom and the bureau V. Makharadze, the new chairman of the Volgograd Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies. However, the chairman of the oblast soviet turned down the obkom bureau membership.

This was so unexpected that some people vehemently insisted on voting on the motion without Makharadze's consent. To be sure, it did not come to this. First Secretary A. Anipkin, who appeared as surprised by the refusal as everyone else, tried to extinguish passions, saying that this issue can be revisited some time later.

Let us not jump to conclusions. Categorical judgments are hardly in order here: Supposedly, such things have not happened in relations between the soviet and the party committee, and the position Makharadze has taken is dubious.

First of all, there was no challenge to the party obkom on the part of the oblast soviet chairman. He said: "I am a communist, and I am not renouncing my convictions." However, let me stress that refusing to become a member of the bureau is a principled position of V. Makharadze's in his capacity as chairman of the oblast soviet of people's deputies, a principled position to which he intends to adhere even if this issue is discussed again, as A. Anipkin, first secretary of the obkom, said. Why? So that the bureau would not pressure the chairman of the soviet, and thus the entire soviet. There is party discipline, explained Makharadze, and according to the statute I am altogether obligated to obey a decision made by the bureau. What kind of independence is this...

Let us recall that in the past the chairman of the oblispolkom [oblast executive committee], number one in the hierarchy of the soviet power, became a member of the bureau virtually automatically. In the bureau, he quite as automatically was placed under the first secretary, and in his absence the second secretary, and so on. Besides, the chairman was confirmed by, once again, the bureau.

What has changed by now? Here is a striking fact: Makharadze was told about the plenum only two days in advance. Let us recall that the agenda included the cooperation of the party and soviet organs. Such was the invitation to "cooperate." Meanwhile, Makharadze represents the new soviet, which began to work after the widely known upheaval in the oblast and assumed power at a time when the situation in the economy of the region was deteriorating abruptly.

I will not quote many statistics which illustrate the decline. I will only give two statistics associated with the supply of foodstuffs. In the first quarter, 12 percent less meat was produced than last year and 13 percent less milk. When A. Anipkin talked about this at the plenum, he also communicated that the deputy chairman of the oblast agroindustrial association for animal husbandry was severely disciplined by the party, and it was recommended that the issue of his holding the post further be considered. As far as the party penalty goes, it is understandable. However, why is the obkom bureau still involved in personnel matters of the subdivisions reporting to the soviet and its ispolkom [executive committee]?

Further on, I will just give quotations: "We cannot allow the soviets at all levels and their presidiums to handle administrative functions.... The soviets of all levels and their ispolkoms should...."—I will not carry on. Who is pointing out to the soviets "of all levels" what they "should not allow" and what they "should?" Where is it from, from what era? This is from a report by the party obkom first secretary, A. Anipkin, at the aforementioned plenum with "cooperation" on the agenda.

However, "attempts to diminish the role of the soviets will now run into resistance." This is also a quote from the speech by Yu. Chekhov, chairman of the Volgograd City Soviet, at the plenum. V. Makharadze also spoke, and, of course, not with a laudatory word about the report-maker. Words, even if the most correct, are merely words. However, it is exactly the point that in the very short period of time since the elections many new and promising things have appeared in the work of the soviets.

V. Makharadze said: "After analyzing the currently existing structure of local power, we asked ourselves whether it is necessary to treat everyone the same. After all, conditions in localities differ, the number of inhabitants and the customs vary. Why should the people not

decide for themselves, at an assembly or a meeting, what type of administration they want? This may be a soviet of the territory with the right to govern directly and hire its staff independently. If an assembly resolves to elect a commissioner, it is welcome to. In urban microrayons, we also want to create administrative-public entities enjoying the rights of corporate persons, with their own bank accounts. They will begin handling municipal business, and in the long run, in consultation with the citizens, will facilitate the opening of private workshops and small shops and outlets. It is provided that issues affecting all residents (for example, the construction of some facility in the microrayon) may be resolved, at their request, by way of a referendum. Of course, I have not referred to everything, but even this enumeration explains why the soviet is now protecting its independence so vigorously."

This is why I would not classify the refusal of V. Makharadze to become a member of the bureau as an emergency situation, all the more so because A. Anipkin himself made definite statements in favor of the independence of the soviets when he was elected first secretary after the collective resignation of the old bureau. The plenum just held looked somewhat strange against this background. We would very much hope that the sparks dropped there do not start a conflict between the new bureau of the party obkom and the new soviets.

Western Republics

Five Killed in Ukraine Mine Explosion

PM1306121790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 12 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Reportage on Donetsk mining disaster]

[Text] [Newscaster] Alarming news has arrived from Donetsk where an explosion occurred at the mine named for Zasyadko 11 June during drilling operations in a mine.

[Voice of unidentified mine official] [video shows various aspects of the mine, flag flying at half-mast] There were 11 people in the mine working. Five were killed, and two of our comrades received injuries of varying degrees of severity and have been hospitalized.

[N.S. Surgay, first deputy chairman of the Ukrainian State Inspection for Technical and Mining Supervision, identified by caption] There were 12 people in adjoining mine workings: They are now undergoing medical checks in the oblast clinic for occupational diseases. A commission is carefully investigating all questions, giving practical assistance to the mine in eliminating the consequences of the accident and attending to all questions connected with social security and pensions for the victims.

[Correspondent A. Makarskiy, identified by caption] The city soviet has declared the day of the miners' burial a day of mourning. Participants in the national miners' congress paid tribute to the memory of those who perished and, rallying together, they set aside the difficulties of the first day's proceedings and moved on to a businesslike debate of the complex problems facing the sector.

Party Officials Not Invited to Miners' Congress

PM1206124390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Dispatch by correspondent N. Lisovenko: "First USSR Miners Congress"]

[Text] Donetsk—Its agenda includes the social status of USSR miners, progress in implementing USSR Council of Ministers Resolution No. 608, the coal sector's work in conditions of a regulated market economy, and the question of the official trade union's work.

A press conference was given by members of the first congress' organizational committee the day before. Journalists asked why the strike committees at some production associations had categorically objected to the congress being held now; how, in the organizational committee's opinion, Resolution No. 608 is being implemented; why reports have appeared saying that it is planned to hold a congress in Moscow in mid-August; and whether the question of setting up an independent miners' trade union and taking strike action will be discussed.

The replies betrayed a tendency toward dissociation from the actions by the leadership of the Coal Industry Workers' Trade Union Central Council which, together with the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry, in the organizational committee's opinion, did everything possible to stop the congress being held and only decided to take part when they became convinced that it was not in their power to change anything. It is not only members of the delegations who lack unity on a series of very important problems, but members of the organizational committee as well.

The forum in Donetsk is distinguished by the high level of politicization of its delegates. The miners have invited Soviet and foreign journalists, official trade union representatives, and Soviet workers to all the congress sessions but they have not sent a single invitation to members of the party apparatus. The congress will work until the end of the week.

Grinev Elected Supreme Soviet Deputy Chairman

LD0906022790 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Summary] Vladimir Borisovich Grinev, a deputy from Kharkov, a university lecturer, was today elected deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet.

Only 342 deputies took part in the voting. V.B. Grinev received 237 votes; 104 deputies voted against him.

'Constructive Opposition' Formed in Ukraine

LD0906185190 Moscow TASS in English 2016 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Stanislav Volnyanskiy]

[Text] Kiev June 9 TASS—Deputies from the Democratic Bloc announced on Friday at a session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet that they are forming a parliamentary opposition group called Narodna Rada (People's Council).

The statement was made by Deputy Igor Yukhnovskiy from Lvov, a physicist and member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. He represents a bloc of supporters of the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka (RUKH), the [words indistinct].

A progamme of the opposition includes three main items: national sovereignty of the Ukraine, a multi-party parliament, and various forms of property.

It envisages "the ownership by the Ukrainian people of all property on the republic's territory," the priority of republican laws over Union ones and the coming into force of Union laws only after they are ratified by the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet. Various forms of property also means private property, including ownership of land.

Yukhanovskiy stressed that the presence of constructive opposition was necessary for showing an alternative approach to important problems.

It was the second major demarche of the Democratic Bloc at the current session of the Ukrainian parliament. Early this week its representatives refused to take part in the voting during the election of the chairman of the republican Supreme Soviet on contested elections.

Status of Autocephalous Orthodox Church Noted

LD0906053990 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1700 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] The creation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church has been proclaimed in Kiev. This was accomplished by the constituent synod, which has ended in the capital of Ukraine.

Among its participants were clergymen, laymen, and foreign guests. The synod has approved the rules of this church. It was stated that the church comes out for independence from the Moscow Patriarchate. The new church has not, as yet, been granted official registration.

Christian Democratic League Holds Congress

LD1006035490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1237 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS Correspondent Nikolay Lazar]

[Text] Kishinev, 9 Jun (TAS)—The First Congress of the Moldovian Women's Christian Democratic League [Khristianskos-demokratischeskaya Liga Zhenshchin Moldovy] was held here today. Nine hundred and fifty-two delegates took part in its work, representing around 10,000 members of this republican public organization.

Among the league's main objectives, as written into its program and charter, are the social protection of children and mothers, the creation of conditions for the fuller opening up of women's spiritual and creative potential, and active participation in creating a democratic state guaranteeing real rights for women in all areas of life.

The congress elected the leading bodies of the Moldova Women's Christian Democratic League, a central council and its executive committee.

Romanian TV Chief Visits Moldavia

LD1006184390 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 30 May 90 p 1

[Excerpts] Rezvan Teodorescu, chairman of Free Romanian Radio and Television, visited our republic from 25-27 May, returning a visit to Romania by A.P. Usatyy, chairman of the MSSR [Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic] State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting this past March. During a meeting in Bucharest they signed an agreement on creative cooperation between Moldavian and Romanian television and radio and discussed a working plan for the years 1990-1992.

The main purpose of this trip by the chairman of Free Romanian Radio and Television is to promote the further expansion of contacts in the cultural sphere between people living in Soviet Moldavia and Romania through the media of television and radio. [passage omitted]

Rezvan Teodorescu was received by M.I. Snegur, chairman of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet. [passage omitted]

Objections to Changing Moldavia's Name Noted

LD1206114890 Moscow World Service in English 0710 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Excerpt] As the Moldavian parliament is meeting in session in Kishinev, it has decided to rename this constituent republic in the southwest of the Soviet Union into a Soviet Socialist Republic of Moldova. Our correspondent has more.

About 100 MPs [Members of Parliament] who represent the interests of all those in the republic who don't speak Moldavian are not taking part in the session. They protest the behavior of most MPs, who, they believe, adopt decisions that meet the intersts of Moldavians alone. Some of the MPs who walked out have convened a congress of their own and virtually formed a parallel government. This ignored some of the laws the Moldavian Parliament has adopted and presses for the region inhabited by the Russian-speaking people to enjoy autonomy. The parliament has censured this as destabilizing the situation in the repubilc. The chairman of the Moldavian Parliament, Mircha Snegur, has more.

[Begin Snegur recording, in Russian, fading to English translation] How can one play in such a small republic with the idea of any autonomous entities? I don't believe this is what we must think about. I hope and believe we'll adjust relations with the help of MPs and I hope the leaders of informal movements pressing for autonomy will change their minds. [end recording]

The Moldavian parliament has dismissed the congress of splinter MPs as unlawful and revoked the decisions of this congress. Besides, it has asked the office of the Moldavian prosecutor general to prosecute all those who call for a national and territorial division of Moldavia. The parliamentary decisions are aimed at forestalling more ethnic tension in Moldavia. Many MPs agree with this. [passage omitted]

Caucasus

Transcaucasian Railroad 'Approaching Normal'

LD1206115190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Despite individual shortcomings, the situation on the remaining main rail lines of the Transcaucasus is approaching normal. Thanks to the measures taken during the past three months, as a TASS correspondent has reported, since the resumption of rail communications between Azerbaijan and Armenia the steady transportation of cargo in both directions has been successfully ensured. Tens of thousands of wagons containing food, construction materials and structures, and industrial and agricultural output have been conveyed as designated.

However, the latest events in the Armenian capital during which an attack on servicemen accompanying the Kafan-Yerevan passenger train occurred do not offer the opportunity for it to be maintained that the transportation situation has been fully returned to normal.

Armenia Reports 'Tense' Weekend 9-10 June

NC1206112190 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] According to the log of the Armenian Republic's Internal Affairs Ministry, the operational situation was tense over the weekend of 9-10 June.

Serious crimes were reported in some regions of the republic. Ovanesyan, director of the rest house in Byurakan belonging to the automobile transportation ministry, died of gunshot wounds at the Ashtarak hospital. The city and rayon department of the Internal Affairs Ministry has determined that Ovanesyan was killed by a former convict and unemployed Yerevan citizen, Mkrtichyan, who has been detained. An investigation has been opened into the case.

An armed group attacked the guard detail at the Stepanavan city and rayon department of the Internal Affairs Ministry on 10 June and seized five pistols and five radios. The deputy commander, Movsisyan, was taken to the hospital with gunshot wounds.

The day before, members of a traffic patrol stopped a VAZ car without license plates at km 2 on the Stepanavan-Kalinino road. The driver refused to show his documents. At that moment, an armed driver stepped out of a VAZ-2121 car which also had no license plate and demanded that the first car be released. The passengers in the first car then opened fire with automatic weapons and a pistol at the traffic patrol's car, wounding a patrolman. They seized his weapon and escaped.

Militia Sergeant Lokinov from Kostroma oblast executive committee, who was appointed to the (Rostransdanstroy) team in Leninakan, was also attacked by criminals. He lost consciousness and his personal weapon was stolen.

There are also cases of militia workers undertaking resolute operations to deter crimes by gangs and violations of law. Grigoryan, a militiaman attached to the patrol guard at the Leninakan city department of the Internal Affairs Ministry, used his weapon to prevent gang hooliganism at the city parking lot. One of the three robbers being arrested in Leninakan stabbed senior militiaman Baloyan three times. Baloyan was forced to use his weapon and wounded his attacker. Both were taken to the hospital. A militia group which arrived at the scene detained one accomplice in the robbery. Measures have been taken to uncover the identity of the third robber.

Crime investigation workers at the Yerevan city department of the Internal Affairs Ministry have detained the [name indistinct] brothers who were trying to escape after seizing a foreign-made recorder from a victim at a car lot. They resisted with a knife and an iron bar but were disarmed by the militia workers and the stolen good was returned.

A new act of vandalism has taken place in Yerevan. Unidentified persons set off a bomb at the statue of Gukas Gukasyan in the Apovyan Street Park, damaging the upper part of the statue. To check the spread of tension in the republic, to prevent (?damage) to statues of renowned union and republican communist party activists, and to establish law and order everywhere, Internal Affairs Ministry units and subunits have been instructed to respond energetically to all criminal actions

against state property and citizens' personal goods and to use weapons resolutely in case of threats to the life and health of the citizens, militia workers, and servicemen.

Armenian Officials Denounce Critical Report

NC1206145390 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1850 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Excerpts] An appeal has been made to KRASNAYA ZVEZDA editor in chief Panov and USSR Internal Affairs Minister Batakin by USSR People's Deputy and First Secretary of the Mardakertskiy Rayon Party Committee Vagan Gabriyelyan, First Secretary of Stepanakert City Party Committee Valeriy Atadzhanyan, and Chairman of the Stepanakert City Soviet Executive Committee of People's Deputies Maksim Mirzoyan.

They write: The report in the 2 June issue of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA entitled "Impediments in the Way of Good Neighborly Relations," under the signature of Yanchenkov, chief of the Department of Coordination With the Mass Media at the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry, is in itself a grave impediment to the establishment of good neighborly relations in Transcaucasia and to the resolution of the conflict in general. We leave the judgements made about the events in Armenia to the conscience of this man who serves as liaison between the paper and the law enforcement bodies. For those of us from the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], it is difficult to judge facts we are unable to verify. We not only dispute the description and assessment of the situation in the NKAO, but also demand an official inquiry into the crude violation of journalistic ethics, distortion of facts, and slander of officials. Lieutenant Ostrovskiy, deputy chief of the political department of the military commandant's office of the state of emergency region, told us Yanchekov was not in the NKAO during or after the incidents described in the publication. Yet, repeating the claim of the press-center of the so-called Organizational Committee in the NKAO, Yanchekov declares that the majority of the Armenian population in the oblast was satisfied with the detention of 19 extremists on 24-26 April who were accused of instigating disturbances in Stepanakert. It would not have hurt the author or you to know that on 24 April, the 75th anniversary of the genocide of the Armenians, the entire Armenian population of the oblast was taking part in the mourning ceremony. If Military Commandant Major General Safonov, who is determined to settle accounts with the unarmed Armenian population, had not placed the six poets and intellectuals who spoke at the monument under administrative detention, then thousands of people would not have gathered in front of the commandant's office and no citizens or servicemen would have been injured during the dispersal of the crowd. [passage omitted]

Regarding the major point, we ask: who gave the author the permission or order to declare that the Mardakertskiy Rayon Party Committee has ostensibly decided to send its rayon representative to the republican Organizational Committee in the NKAO, and that the first secretary of Stepanakert City Party Committee and the chairman of Stepanakert City Soviet Executive Committee—comrades Atadzhanyan and Mirzoyan—have allegedly agreed to enlist in that infamous Organizational Committee? Such a statement is an outright lie intertwined with political intrigues that escape us.

Esteemed minister and editor in chief, we are sure that you value highly the terms truth, officer's honor, and citizen's conscience. We demand the dispatch of a functionary independent of Baku and that you publish a refutation in the paper and open an official inquiry into the activities of Yanchenkov, who is displaying complete insubordination to a department which is responsible for the selection of materials concerning the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry and for their publication in the mass media.

Monument to Armenian Komsomol Leader Blown Up

PM1206114490 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jun 90 p 1

["Own information" report: "Explosion by Night"]

[Text] On Saturday night, the people of Yerevan were awoken by a powerful explosion that shook the city center. In the morning it became clear that the monument to one of the organizers of the republic Komsomol [Communist Youth League], Gukas Gukasyan, had been blasted into the air. It has become known to us that Armenia's informal organizations are firmly dissociating themselves from this action. An investigation is in progress.

'Strife' Among Georgian Nationalists Viewed

PM1206081790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Second Edition p 3

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kaushanskiy: "The Legacy of 'Uncle Koba'"]

[Text] Today it is not so easy to keep abreast of events taking place in the republic. Only a short interval divided the first round of the republic Communist Party congress and the first Georgian National Congress held in the past few days. And right after this on 26 May, a colorful festival literally burst out on the streets of Tbilisi and other cities marking the Day of the Restoration of State Independence, with bright national costumes, inspired speakers, and vivacious songs so characteristic of the Georgians.

On this day in the little resort suburb of Kodzhori, Ilia II—catholicos and patriarch of all Georgia—blessed the unveiling of the monument to the servicemen of the Georgian republic who fell in the February battles of 1921, while the long-awaited soccer match between Georgian and Lithuanian teams crowned the ceremonies. And of course, there were rallies and rallies....

Innocent visitors to the city scarcely paid attention on the day of the holiday to the fact that one group of political parties in the National Forum was holding a rally at Government House, which then moved to the Central Stadium. Another group, which recently left the forum—which I will talk about later—and which has formed within a new structure under the name "Roundtable," met at the former "Lokomotiv" stadium, the present 26 May Stadium. In principle the same speeches were made by both sides of the once united opposition. Speeches on independence and sovereignty, on the withdrawal of the "occupying" troops, and the consolidation of society.

A crack had formed in the once solid building of the opposition. The first to slam the door was Z. Gamsakhurdiya, leader of the Helsinki Alliance. With him, the following left the National Forum: the Monarchist (Conservative) Party, the Society of Saint Ilia the Pious, and the All-Georgia Society of Merab Kostava, which then formed the "Roundtable" coalition.

So the National Forum, which was rather depleted as a result of this, became the core around which hard-liners and a whole series of parties and social organizations of a liberal trend—which are already known to readers from previous articles—came together.

As before, both sides are united by the many things they have in common in strategy and in their views of Georgia's future, but nevertheless the tangible tension between the "Roundtable" and the National Forum in questions of tactics gives the whole movement the air of a bird supporting itself on two wings, both torn from fighting—to use one graphic expression. However, this did not stop the National Forum, which includes a bloc of over 40 parties, from assembling so representative a congress. The sports palace where it was held 23-25 May had enough space for an average number of people—around 6,000 delegates. The aim was to discuss the problems of the Georgian national movement; to ratify the draft law on elections to the alternative representative organ, the national congress; and to elect a coordination center for this purpose.

The "Roundtable" did not just ignore the congress by not participating in it, it also refused to recognize its authority to speak on behalf of the people in the face of a division. Furthermore, Z. Gamsakhurdiya considered the very idea of holding such elections to be wrong while an official authority exists in the form of the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. By the way, the "Roundtable's" political concept as published in the press says precisely that any elections in Georgia will be legal as long as they are not Soviet.

In this light, the decisions of the national congress just held seem preferable to many even if only because the taboo has been lifted by majority vote from the opposition parties' and social organizations' participation in elections on two fronts, both for the congress and for the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet. Moreover, the Georgian Communist Party's participation in the election campaign was also recognized as possible.

And so the draft law on elections to the national congress has been adopted. A coordination center has been formed which involves representatives of many political parties, societies, associations, creative unions, and the Georgian Academy of Sciences. Places have been reserved for the participants in the "Roundtable." Obviously this is as long as they support the already established election scenario.

The current situation in the national movement is quite complex, but it is not considered an impasse. With the desire and goodwill of both sides it is still possible to come to an agreement. The "Green" party and the National Consensus association are offering their peacemaking services in this connection. Hard-line leaders I. Tsereteli, G. Chanturiya, and a number of others have even proposed that Z. Gamsakhurdiya hold television debates in order to clarify who is actually to blame for the split. But something else is obvious—neither the National Forum nor the "Roundtable," unlike the Communist Party, has put forward even a roughly formulated economic program.

And there is another blank page in both sides' documents. How is Georgia to live within the family with whom it shared misfortune and happiness as well as drank from the same source of culture for so many decades, or rather centuries? Somehow no attempt to reflect on the future of the common home—without which the fate of the poor relative obviously awaits us, not just materially but also spiritually—is to be seen behind the jungle of stock phrases about annexation and occupation.

This generally simple thought is being interpreted in one form or another by people of various political views and convictions. There are those who believe that the numerous problems of the republic, which depends totally on imported raw materials and which is geared to the all-Union market, cannot be resolved just by the act of declaring independence. "Today it is not we who are proposing the rules of the game," G. Patsuriya, editor of MOLODEZH GRUZII, writes in his newspaper. "We have to reconcile ourselves to this. And at the moment, looking at the national movement, I have the feeling that some people are smiling through their mustaches. Uncle Koba [Stalin] used to smile pleasantly through his moustache."

This is about the attempt in the struggle for independence and sovereignty to rely on authoritarian methods, and about the perniciousness of personal ambition and a monopoly on the last word on the truth which leads, in the final analysis, to the internecine strife that can be seen today in the Georgian national movement even with the naked eye. Indeed, this is really the legacy of "Uncle Koba" and his times. Many of the republic's

sober-minded politicians see the solution in dialogue and in the consolidation of all forces without exception, including the communists.

Central Asia

Continuing Reportage on Disorder in Kirghizia

Situation Updated

LD1206124390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1115 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Frunze, 12 June (KIRTAG-TASS)—The joint measures adopted by the government of Kirghizia and Uzbekistan are beginning to bring results. The situation in Osh oblast and the Uzbekistan rayons bordering on it is becoming normal. Troops and Ministry of Internal Affairs bodies are monitoring the most explosive centres of tension, and reinforced patrols are blocking approaches by terrorist groups to populated areas. Both local party and local soviet bodies have started to operate more actively.

The Uzbekistan government is coming out categorically against the demands made by individual citizens and extremist groups that an autonomous region be granted to the Uzbek population on the territory of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], Shukurulla Mirsaidov, the chairman of the council of ministers of the Uzbek SSR, stated. At a meeting between the leaders of Kirghizia and Uzbekistan which took place in Osh he stressed, "We must all take a strong stand to the effect that individuals of Uzbek nationality living on the territory of Kirghizia, as well as individuals of Kirghiz nationality living on the territory of Uzbekistan, are citizens of these republics. We are in favor of non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign republics, of friendship and mutual understanding, and of the creation of relations that make a confrontation between the two peoples impossible."

Situation Becoming 'Stabilized'

LD1206213790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1955 GMT 12 Jun 90

[From the "Television news service" program]

[Text] Confrontation between Kirghiz and Uzbeks has been going on since 4 June. According to the Kirghiz Ministry of Internal Affairs, as of today the number of dead and injured has exceeded 600. However, latest reports say the situation is becoming stabilized. At meetings held here the local people are seeking ways out of the crisis. [video shows people walking in grounds of large official building; old lady weighing vegetables; empty market stalls]

Update on Status of Violence

LD1206155390 Frunze Domestic Service in Kirghiz 1400 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Since the start of the mass disturbance, 139 people have been killed, including one militia worker and one soldier; 486 people have been wounded; 261 houses, 23 state installations, 66 vehicles have been burned; 190 firearms have been confiscated; and 374 people have been detained for violating the curfew.

Osh Region Quiet, Frunze Normal

LD1306075190 Moscow TASS in English 0743 GMT 13 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Boris Mainayev]

[Text] Frunze June 12 TASS—The troubled Osh region in Kirghizia was quiet on Tuesday night, the Kirghizian Interior Ministry reported. Thirty-five incidents were registered, including three murders.

Bloodletting in Osh region between ethnic Kirgiz and Uzbeks began on June 4.

The stabilisation of the situation allowed search and resuce groups to commence their activities. According to available data, 148 people have been killed since the unrest began, including a law enforcement employee and a serviceman.

The search for a militiaman, missing since June 7, continues. A total of 885 people turned to medical institutions for help, 748 wounded have been put into hospitals. Some 230 firearms and 23 incendiary bombs have been confiscated.

The majority of enterprises in Osh region are functioning normally. Shops are open. Transport services have normalised. Agricultural work has been started in districts where shots were fired on Tuesday.

The situation in Frunze, the Kirghizian capital, is normal.

Kazakh CP Congress Reflects 'Gentler' Change

PM1306080590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jun 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondents G. Dildyayev, T. Yesilbayev, A. Petrushov, and V. Ryzhkov: "Its Own Line"]

[Text] Alma-Ata—Like any other republic, Kazakhstan appears as a separate entity on the present-day political map of the country. But, in our view, the stability that many areas have been literally hungering for is tangible and visible here. What is the explanation for this, and what measures are being implemented to prevent social "seizures"?

Things That Absolutely Have To Be Preserved

We have heard the patronizing and scornful descriptions of Kazakhstan: a sleepy republic, people's social activity zero. How shall I put it, how shall I put it.... We talked with young Alma-Ata construction worker K. Amenov, who had been on a tour of the Baltic republics, and he came up with an "aphorism": "They have held more rallies, we have constructed more apartments." This is confirmed by statistics. In the first quarter of this year, the five-year plan for commissioning housing was fulfilled and there was a significant increase in the rate of construction of schools, polyclinics, and hospitals. And that against a general background of unionwide despondency!

Food supplies have also improved. Meat production has increased by more than 285,000 tons and milk production by 649,000 tons compared with the average annual level in the last five-year plan.

So what has Kazakhstan "slept through" and in what area has it fallen behind? In armed interethnic confrontations? In language dramas? In unconfined political pluralism on the squares? In self-isolation—like Lithuania's, for example? Various political missionaries would like to "export" this and much else to the republic. But not a hint of a new color has appeared on Kazakhstan's red banner, and social processes are not knocking people out of their stride.

In our view, the situation in the republic enables us to reflect, I dread to say, on the positive aspects of conservatism. Let us remember that conservation is preservation. Kazakhstan has managed to preserve things that absolutely had to be preserved. Civil peace above all, even though as readers will recall the first mass disturbances, the so-called December events of 1986, occurred in Alma-Ata. Recently, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo revised its assessments of those events and removed from the people the offensive label of "Kazakh nationalism." We are sure that civil peace in the republic can only become stronger as a result.

The reality is that the speed of politicization of the population could have been higher here, but at least it did not turn people's heads and it did not distract them from harsh reality. We can testify that so far we have not seen a surge of glasnost in the media here. And some party bureaucrats have taken the liberty of indulging in non-multiple-choice elections, albeit warily. The embryonic public movements lack clear-cut programs and the populace is deaf to most of them. All this is true, but political passions are more easily "digested" on a full stomach and there remains a sufficiency of food products in Kazakhstan, albeit, let us reiterate, a relative one. Yet only a little more than a year ago the "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" people's movement was the leader of the antinuclear movement in the country and the world.

In short, the situation here did not explode, as it typically did in other regions, when the pace of economic change failed to keep up with the pace of democratization. We could put it this way: the revolution (and we are still calling perestroyka a revolution) in Kazakhstan is "gentler." This is also indicated by the precongress report and election conference in the republic's party organizations. Relations between the "obkoms" [oblast committees] and the "street" have been peaceful in Kazakhstan. Moreover, we have even seen the slogan "Hands off our first secretary!"

The Kazakhstan communists' congress lasted three days. To be honest, we did not expect complicated intrigues, dramatic developments, or uncompromising clashes. Despite a pretty broad spectrum of opinions and sentiments, it was a discussion among party comrades who accept the blame for the mistakes and also assume the burden of responsibility for getting out of the deep crisis. So the congress was able to state that the chief political result of the period under review is that the republic party organization has preserved its positions as a consolidating force in the difficult conditions.

The atmosphere of the congress and the thrust of its work are eloquently described by the title of the political report delivered by N.A. Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee and president of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]—"For party unity and the socialist option, for real sovereignty for Kazakhstan in a renewed USSR."

Now that the concept of perestroyka is to a certain extent understood and supported by the masses, the report said, we possess all the potential to elaborate and implement a full program of ideological activity. It is the party's supreme task as well as the key to its rebirth and to the removal of the enervating dogmatic elements of Stalinism and the stagnation period.

The country is very familiar with cases where the unclear, equivocal stance of the top leaders, particularly on questions of interethnic relations, has led step by step to conformism or separatism and has ended in tragedy for the people. Therefore, N.A. Nazarbayev's tart reaction to the proposal by one participant of the recent Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee Plenum that the party should be given a pronounced ethnic character was highly appropriate.

"The Kazakh Communist Party is the repository of the interests of the entire population of our republic," Nursultan Abishevich said. "When we talk about the republic's national interests we mean all nations, not just a single nation."

Assessing the attempts to split the CPSU along ethnic and territorial lines, the Kazahstan communists' congress unequivocally opposed the idea of turning a single party into a confederation of regional parties.

Sovereignty Arguments

Kazakhstan's place and significance in unionwide division of labor is well known. Nevertheless, let us supply a few facts. The republic annually exports raw materials

worth $1.3-1.5 billion and provides union stocks with 10-12 million tons of grain, more than 300,000 tons of meat, and 270,000 tons of milk. But in terms of their living standards the people of Kazakhstan are obviously lagging behind other republics.

Delegates saw the granting of economic sovereignty to Kazakhstan as a guarantee of the improvement of the people's life. The following figure was cited: in Kazakhstan, 93 percent of industry is under union control. That is, labor collectives are not in charge of the results of their labor and what the republic and its people get from the available resources is the crumbs. Everything is taken away to the departmental stores, and now any sensible person can see that there is no control over the economy—there is no sovereignty. In the opinion of the congress participants, the delay in resolving the sovereignty question was one reason for the centrifugal aspirations of some republics. But at the same time, at the congress and in conversations with us, communists have said that close unity and strong and stable national accord is particularly essential now for all the Union's republics. Everyone said that without it the most convincing scientific and economic concept collapses like a house of cards.

Indeed, republican economic autonomy is a development imperative, an integral part of state independence. But in no way does it signify a tendency toward isolation and exclusiveness. And it is not a matter of sheer pragmatism, although it is time to stop being ashamed of the fact that our people want to earn more and, therefore, to live better. From worker to obkom first secretary, everyone cogently argued that the realization of the potential of perestroyka in the republic is still running into a blank wall of bans, quotas, and licenses erected by union ministries and departments. The endless bureaucratic obstacles have exasperated people. Economic sovereignty and a switch to a regulated market economy—this is what can and must curb the command-and-administer diktat, stir people's initiative, and unleash their enterprise. And the republic is rich in them.

In short, the 17th Kazakh Communist Party Congress made a firm choice in this case. Let us quote some lines from the adopted resolution: "The congress believes that in order to give the economy the requisite dynamism, to improve productivity and work quality, to eliminate leveling and social dependence, and to accelerate scientific-technical progress, there is no means more effective than a switch to the market combined with flexible state regulation." At the same time it stated that during the economic renewal period considerable work will be done to provide people, particularly the badly-off groups of the population, with social protection. To this end a range of measures has been elaborated which will help to overcome the negative attitude to the market.

"Before a decision is made," Dzhezkazgan party obkom First Secretary Ye. Yezhikov-Babakhanov said, "a thorough, expert social appraisal is needed of the instrument of reforms from the viewpoint of the interests of the majority of the population, particularly the needy. We may lose a few months, but we will gain in terms of the situation's stability and people's confidence.

The Command of the Times

Kazakhstan is on the threshold of fundamental economic changes. Communists are taking on difficult responsibilities. Will the party be able to convince the people and get them behind it, and what does it need to do to that end? Radical restructuring of all intraparty life, in the opinion of the vast majority of delegates, is what will affirm the party's right to political leadership. A great deal has already been done to that end and, as a matter of fact, this has helped the Communist Party not to lose the initiative in the solution of very important questions that affect the social and political climate. At last real attention has been paid to remote rural areas. The tragedies of the Aral, Balkhash, and the Semipalatinsk regions are causing real pain among the people.... The Communist Party supports public demands for a ban on nuclear weapon tests and has urged all the Central Asian republics to participate in saving the Aral Sea. Communists feel that they are really in charge of their party organizations. It is no accident that since the 16th Kazakh Communist Party Congress, its membership has increased by 31,600 and the party now numbers over 842,000 CPSU full and candidate members in its ranks. The new members include many workers and peasants. Meetings in labor collectives and conversations with people of different strata and ages demonstrate that Kazakhstan people are pinning great hopes on the Communist Party.

We have to agree with the view of USSR people's deputy and poet O. Suleymenov who believes that the past should be respected and our history not condemned out of hand. In it there have been many valuable and good things which should be cherished and preserved, above all our chief asset—the friendship of the peoples. Much ridiculed and mocked, it remains a living reality which has made Kazakhstan what it is today. And there is no finer aim for communists than strengthening the friendship of our peoples. This is the way the Communist Party confirms its authority and becomes the consolidating force of society.

There was a sincere discussion at the congress about improving the activities of the party's primary components and strengthening them. Take the speech by Samat Tuyakbayev, party committee secretary at the Kazakh machinery testing station and experimental farm in Alma-Ata Oblast. He was speaking on behalf of the republican council of primary party organizations' secretaries. The council was set up recently, but it has immediately strengthened direct links between primary and central party organs. Talking about this, Samat raised a whole series of questions concerning primary organizations and proposed, in particular, organizing training for secretaries, arranging the publication of special booklets on perestroyka in the CPSU, establishing the status of the primary party organization

secretary, and doing everything to resurrect and give due prominence to the concept of party comradeship.

The delegates spoke enthusiastically about the character of the new CPSU Statutes and provisions of the Central Committee Platform. Supporting these precongress documents, they stressed that the Statutes should clearly define the goal of communists, provide a clear interpretation of the principle of democratic centralism, and consolidate the foundations of CPSU ideological and organizational unity while altering the status of union republican communist parties in favor of expanding their autonomy. Also important is the fact that republican parties' autonomy, combined with the republics' sovereignty, will help eliminate the appalling "superconductivity" of erroneous, voluntarist decisions by the center in our society. A Kazakh Communist Party platform was adopted at the congress.

The period between the two latest Kazakhstan congresses has contained the whole gamut of feelings—from despondency at the obviously delayed launch of democratization to, for all that, strengthened hope. And this hope is maintained primarily by the fact that the republic has its own political line—not a borrowed one, but one it has struggled to achieve, merciful and resolute at the same time and maintaining a safety margin in social relations. This margin is so necessary today when everything is literally being tested to breaking point.

Expressing concern in connection with the well-known events in the neighboring fraternal republic's Osh Oblast, the delegates sent a letter to the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee and Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers.

A letter was also addressed to the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet, and USSR Council of Ministers concerning the total cessation of nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk site and its conversion in the interests of the national economy.

The congress confirmed the powers of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee and auditing commission members elected at oblast party conferences. A statute "On the Status of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee Member" and a decision on the creation of a republican Communist Party Central Committee Politburo were adopted. Kazakh SSR President N.A. Nazarbayev was elected first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee and member of the Politburo by direct, secret ballot.

The congress extended the powers of the party forum delegates until the end of the year. The 17th Kazakh Communist Party Congress delegates adopted a statement "For unity in the CPSU" addressed to the upcoming 28th CPSU Congress.

The congress was addressed by CPSU Central Committee Secretary A.N. Girenko.